Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series

General Editors
Dalsukh Malvania
Ambalal P Shah

No 9

THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA OF RĀMACANDRA AND GUṆACANDRA

A CRITICAL STUDY

By
Dr. K H. Trivedi, M A Ph D Kovid
Head of the Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit
N & A Arts College Vallabh Vidyanagar

L D INSTITUTE OF INDOLOGY
AHMEDABAD
1966

A thesis approved for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Sanskrit
by the
Gujarat University
1961

Printed by Jayant Dalal at Vasant Printing Press Gheekanta
Road, Ahmedabad and Published by Dalsukh Malvania
Director L D Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad-9

First Edition 750 Copies August 1966

Price Rupees 30/=

Copies can be had of

L. D Institute of Indology Ahmedabad-9.
Gurjar Grantha Ratna Karyalaya Gandhi Road, Ahmedabad-1
Motilal Banarasidas Varanasi, Patna, Delhi
Sarasvati Pustak Bhandar Hathikhana Ratanpole, Ahmedabad-1
Munshi Ram Manoharalal Nai Sarak, Delhi
Mehar Chand Lachhamandas Delhi-6
Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office Varanasi,

FOREWORD

We have great pleasure in publishing this Critical Study of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra) by Dr. K. H. Trivedi. In the middle ages Gujarat has produced some of the important works on various subjects, in Sanskrit as well as in Prakrit, to compete with Malawa. Nāṭyadarpaṇa is one of them.

The present study gives a detailed outline of all the topics dealt with in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa, compares the various views with those found in other works on dramaturgy and determines the place of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa in the field of Sanskrit dramaturgy. Dr. Trivedi has drawn the conclusion from this study that from the point of view of clear, lucid and exhaustive treatment of all the important topics pertaining to Sanskrit dramaturgy the Nāṭyadarpaṇa surpasses most of the earlier works. Dr. Trivedi rightly deserves our congratulations for the present study. I must also thank him for allowing us to include the work in our series.

I hope that both the scholars and the students will find this work useful and interesting.

L. D. Institute of Indology
Ahmedabad.
21-5-66

Dalsukh Malvania
Director

PREFACE

This is an humble attempt at a critical study of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, one of the most important works in Sanskrit dealing with the science of dramaturgy. It is a valuable contribution of the Jaina writers to the field of Sanskrit dramaturgy. The present study, with certain modifications and alterations, is baised on my Thesis submitted to the Gujarat University for Ph. D. degree in Sanskrit, and I am most grateful to the University authorities for their kind permission to publish the work.

In the present study I have attempted to give a critical appraisal of all the topics dealt with in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (which has been done in in Part-I of the present work), consider them in the light of a comparative study with other earlier Sanskrit works on dramaturgy from which it has usually borrowed and thereby evaluate the work and establish its place in and contribution to the field of Sanskrit dramaturgy (Part-II).

In Part-I of the present work a chapter has been devoted to each of the four Vivekas of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa The chapters are named after their respective headings in the ND. As regards the treatment of topics, in the beginning I have given a detailed outline of what the ND has to say on that particular topic and this is followed by critical remarks on the same. In Part-II a critical estimate of the ND is attempted especially on the basis of its textual study. Here I have brought out the extent of the indebtedness of the ND to its preceding works, the extent of its originality and its influence, if any, on the later works on the same subject.

This critical and comparative study has led me to the conclusion that from the point of view of clear, lucid and exhaustive treatment of all the important topics related to Sanskrit dramaturgy, the ND surpasses most of the earlier works. I hope that this critical study of the ND which is rather less known but deserves to be known better will enable the students of Sanskrit dramaturgy to judge the work in its proper perspective.

My deep and hearty thanks are primarily due to Shri Dalsukhbhai Malvania, a distinguished savant and the Director of Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad. But for his kind appreciation and personal encouragement to me this work could not have seen the light of day.

I take this opportunity to express my deep sense of gratitude towards my revered Professor Dr V. M. Kulkarni, for his valuable guidance and suggestions at a number of places. My thanks are also due to Dr. V. Raghavan for his thoughtful and scholarly suggestions. I am deeply indebted to Muni Shri Punyavijayaji Maharaj for his keen interest and assistance by providing me with the MSS of some of the unpublished plays of Rāmacandra. I am also grateful to Dr. B. J. Sandesara, the Director of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, for allowing me to make use of the rare MS of the Śṛṅgāraprakāśa of Bhoja. I am thankful to all the learned scholars whose works I have consulted and acknowledged in the Bibliography. I must also acknowledge my thanks to my students and friends and particularly to Dr. H. S Joshi and Prof. I. B. Shukla for their help in preparing the Index.

N. & A. Arts College,
Vallabh Vidyanagar,
1-5-1966.

K. H. Trivedi

ABBREVIATIONS

Abhi.	Abhinavabhāratī
Anargh.	Anargharāghava
B. O. R. I.	Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
BP	Bhāvaprakāśana
Devi.	Devīcandragupta
Dhv.	Dhvanyāloka
DR	Daśarūpaka
GOS	Gaekwad's Oriental Series
H. S. P.	History of Sanskrit Poetics
J. U. B.	The Journal of the University of Bombay
Kaumudī.	Kaumudīmitrāṇanda
KD	Kāvyādarśa
KL	Kāvyālaṅkara
KM	Kāvyamālā Series
KP	Kāvyaprakāśa
KPK	Kāvyaprakāśakhaṇḍana
KS	Kāvyānuśāsana
KTR	Kṛtyārāvaṇa
Māl.	Mālavikāgnimitra
MM	Mallikāmakaranda
MBh.	Mahābhārata
MDR	Mudrārākṣasa
MṚC	Mṛcchakaṭika
Nāg.	Nāgānanda
NBh.	Nirbhayabhīmavyāyoga
ND	Nāṭyadarpaṇa
NLR	Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa
NLV	Nalavilāsanāṭaka
NS	Nāṭyaśāstra
RBh	Raghavābhyudaya
RG	Rasagaṅgādhara
RV	Raghuvilāsa
RS	Rasārṇavasudhākara
RTN	Ratnāvalī
Sāk.	Abhijñānaśākuntala
SD	Sāhityadarpaṇa
SK	Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa
SP	Śṛṅgāraprakāśa
SR	Saṅgītaratnākara
Satya.	Satyahariścandra
TPV	Tāpasavatsarāja
UDR	Udāttarāghava
UTR	Uttararāmacarita
Veṇī.	Veṇīsaṁhāra
Vikram.	Vikramorvaśīya
YBh.	Yādavābhyudaya

CONTENTS

PART - I

(On Text)

PART - II

THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA

OF

RĀMACANDRA AND GUṆACANDRA

A CRITICAL STUDY

PART-I

(TEXT)

CHAPTER 1

NĀṬAKA-NIRṆAYA

General Introduction to the Nāṭyadarpaṇa

The Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, as we know, is an important contribution of the two Jain authors to the field of Sanskrit dramaturgy. The authors of the work have carefully studied and made use of all available earlier literature on the subject. At the same time they do not believe in following blindly. It will be seen, as will be pointed out later on, that they often differ from the earlier authorities and boldly propound their own views. The work, therefore, deserves to be studied critically.

Before we proceed to the chapter-wise study of the text of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ND) it will not be out of place to give here a general introduction to the ND.

The early references to the ND :

Aufrecht's catalogue refers to the work as Nāṭyadarpaṇa. Peterson's report for the year 1892 95, on the other hand, mentions the work as Nāṭakadarpaṇa.

There seem to have been more works than one with the same title as the quotations by the earlier commentators from the Nāṭyadarpaṇa are not found in the present work. Raṅganātha, for instance, in his commentary on the Vikramorvaśīya quotes the authority of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa with reference to the type of Nāndī in the Vikramorvaśīya but the quotation is not found in the ND. Similarly Bharatamallika in his commentary on the Bhaṭṭikāvya quotes the ND to describe Kāhala, a musical instrument, whereupon it can be inferred that there was a work with the title ND which treated of music also. Of course, the present work strictly confines itself to dramaturgy only.[1]

Joint Authorship of the ND :

Joint authorship is not a very common phenomenon in the vast range of Sanskrit literature. There have been cases, where an incomplete work is completed by the later persons but it is not so usual in ancient literature to come across two scholars jointly writing a work in spite of the fact that writing must have been a co-operative endeavour

1. Prof. S. K. De refers to the above quotations from the ND and ascribes them to the ND of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra (H.S.P. Vol. I, pp. 308-9) but obviously he is mistaken.

especially in the old days when the writing material was so scarce. The present ND is an outcome of such a joint effort.

It is difficult to comprehend what exact role Guṇacandra performed in writing this work. Still it appears that Rāmacandra had an upper hand in writing the ND and he must have sought the help of Guṇacandra in collecting details about the various topics by carefully going through all the important critical literature that was available to them.

That Rāmacandra was *proficient* in the technique of Sanskrit drama is quite evident from the number of dramas that he has written; and so it is likely that Rāmacandra dominated in writing the work as it is also borne out by the fact that we find certain ideas or phrases in the ND to be very similar to those in some of the plays of Rāmacandra[1] and that the authors of the ND refer to the plays of Rāmacandra as Svopajña.

NĀṬYADARPAṆA : ITS NATURE

The work Nāṭyadarpaṇa, as the name suggests, treats of the science of drama. The title literally means "a mirror to the science of drama". The title is quite appropriate. Just as a mirror gives a faithful and clear reflection of a particular object at hand, this work too reflects or sheds a flood of light on the science of drama. In a lucid and perspicuous style, the authors give a clear picture of the chief principles of dramaturgy, explaining the critical points and problems that naturally confound a novice.

The work consists of two parts : (i) Kārikās and (ii) Vṛtti (in prose.)

(i) Kārikās are in the form of Sūtras in Anuṣṭubh metre which give an outline of all the topics to be treated in the work and define the important principles in a nut-shell. There are 207 Kārikās in all.

The Kārikās are divided into four chapters. Each chapter is called 'Viveka'. The first is called Nāṭakanirṇaya, treating in full details the nature and form of Nāṭaka, one of the most important forms of drama

---

1 (a) परोपनीतशब्दार्थाः स्वनाम्ना कृतकीर्तयः ।
निबद्धारोऽधुना तेन.................. ॥ — ND, p. 215; MM I, 7

(b) रसप्राणो हि नाट्यविधिः । वर्णार्थबन्धवैदग्धीवासितान्तः-
करणा ये रसमपजहति विद्वांस एव ते, न कवयः । — NLV, p. 77.
रसाः पुनः प्राणाः.................. । — ND, p. 170.

and नानार्थशब्दलौल्येन पराञ्चो ये रसामृतात् ।
विद्वांसस्ते कवीन्द्राणामर्हन्ति न पुनः कथाम् ॥ — ND, p 22, verse 6.

(c) न तथा वृत्तवैचित्री (ना.द.–ऽर्थशब्दोत्प्रेक्षाः) श्लाघ्या नाट्ये (ना द.- काव्ये) यथा रसः । विपाककममप्याम्रमुद्वेजयति नीरसम् ॥ — NLV, p. 77, ND, p. 171.

or Rūpakas. It also enumerates and defines Nāṭaka, plot (vastu), five Avasthās (Ārambha, Yatna, Prāptyāśā, Niyatāpti and Phalāgama), five Arthaprakṛtis (Bīja, Bindu etc.), five Sandhis (Mukha, Pratimukha, Garbha, Avamarṣa and Nirvahaṇa), five Arthopakṣepakas and 64 Sandhyaṅgas and with their treatment the chapter ends.

The Second chapter discusses the form and nature of the remaining eleven types of dramas beginning with Prakaraṇa. The remaining types of dramas are Nāṭikā, Prakaraṇī, Vyāyoga, Samavakāra, Bhāṇa Prahasana, Ḍima, Utsṛṣṭikāṅka, Īhāmṛga and Vīthī. The chapter is consequently named as Prakaraṇādyekādaśarūpanirṇaya i.e., the discussion and establishment of the eleven forms of drama viz. Prakaraṇa and others.

The third chapter is named Vṛtti-Rasa-Bhāvābhinaya-Vicāra i e. consideration of styles, sentiments, states and gesticulation. First, the authors describe four vṛttis-Bhāratī. Sāttvatī, Kaiśikī and Ārabhaṭī. Then they define and explain Rasa and Anubhāvas. They also explain how contradictory sentiments can be accommodated and point out the defects in Rasas. Then they explain the dominant states and the resultant states.

The fourth chapter is named Sarva-rūpakasādhāraṇalakṣaṇanirṇaya. It is a sort of miscellany. It deals with general topics whose knowledge is useful while writing any type of play. It treats of such topics as are common to all the twelve forms of drama. It treats of Nāndī and Dhruvā first. Then follows the discussion of characters-males as well as females-and there are three grades of the characters, viz, upper, middle and lower. The authors of the ND then enumerate the qualities of the hero. Then they give different types of heroines on the basis of their age, particular state of mind, etc. Then follows the enumeration of the qualities of a heroine. Then rules regarding the use of language (dialects) and modes of address for different characters are set forth.

Vṛtti or commentary (gloss) on these Kārikās forms the most important part of the work In Kārikās we find the principles treated in a very brief manner, which are fully explained and illustrated in a very lucid manner in the Vṛtti. The greatness of the work lies not in the Kārikās which are mere reproductions of the earlier theorists like Bharata who have already defined and explained the above topics, but in the lucid and sufficiently exhaustive commentary. Here while explaining a point they also mention the views of other theorists in an impartial manner. They sometimes criticise them if they find them to be defective.

Out of all the four Vivekas, the commentary on the first is the largest and constitutes almost half of the whole text. More than half of this chapter is occupied by the Sandhyaṅgas.

The authors supply the commentary with profuse illustrations. The illustrations are meant to bring the abstract point home to the reader. They are borrowed from different authors, sometimes picked up from the earlier works on rhetorics, like Abhinavabhāratī, Daśarūpaka etc.

At many places the authors give illustrations from Rāmacandra's own literary works, especially plays. Rāmacandra, over and above being a writer on dramaturgy, is a good poet and a competent dramatist. It is but natural that he cites illustrations from his own works which would go to make his works well known also and give the work an air of originality.[1]

A CRITICAL STUDY OF CHAPTER I OF THE ND :

The chapter I is named Nāṭakanirṇaya as it chiefly concerns itself with the complete discussion of Nāṭaka, the first and the foremost of the twelve Rūpakas.

Introductory verses :

The chapter begins with introductory verses. The first verse is a sort of benedictory verse and is the same as the first one in Kārikās and the authors later on point out that the repetition of the verse in the Vṛtti is to denote that the authors of the Kārikās and the Vṛtti are the same.[2] The verse praises the speech of the Jinas, which accomplishes the fourfold end of human life and which controls the law permeating the universe in twelve Aṅgas.

Verse 2 proclaims the object of the work viz., to expound the characteristics of a drama, after having studied so many plays written by great poets.

Verse 3 points out the superiority of the drama to the other forms of literature such as Kathā, Ākhyāyikā etc. The path of Kathā is easy to tread being soft and smooth on account of figures of speech, while the path of drama is difficult to tread being full of manifold billows in the form of sentiments. The authors here seem to point out that the essence of drama is sentiments whose depiction requires a great skill on the part of the poet, while Kathās and such other forms of Śravya Kāvya are concerned with mere narration which is to be decorated by literary excellences such as figures of speech which are comparatively easy to write.

---

1. In this respect Rāmacandra may be well compared with Jagannātha who also illustrates from his own works, being himself a great poet as well as a critic (of course, the ND illustrates from other works also while Jagannātha does not)
2. cf. ND, p. 25, lines 14-15.

Verse 4 describes the qualities esential for a person who wants either to enact or compose dramas. A dramatist must be well-versed in songs, music and dancing - three of the most important elements of drama.[1] He must also have studied the ways of the world.[2] The persons who are devoid of these qualities can never produce great works.

(Veres 5) - He is a true poet who by his piece makes even mortal beings enjoyers of nectar.

Verses 6 and 7 bring out the importance of Rasa in Kāvya. However learned a man may be he cannot be a great poet unless he is successful in creating Rasa. "Those learned ones who are indifferent to nectar-like Rasa out of greed for striking words and meanings never deserve the title of great poets."[3] Though possessed of figures like Pun and others, if not possessed of the Rasas that are charming, the language does not please our mind just as a lady ugly in form even though adorned with ornaments cannot please or attract the mind.

The next verse is in praise of Aucitya or propriety. "A person desirous of being a poet but having no knowledge of propriety becomes a laughing stock of the wise irrespective of his being a penniless pauper or a wealthy monarch."

Then the authors praise the poetic talents in the subsequent four verses. Poetic talent is the soul of all lores and learning like charmingness in ladies. Even the knowers of all the three lores[4] always aspire for it[5]. Two things are always odious to an appreciative person - undeveloped breasts in the case of a lovely damsel and absence of poetry in the case of a learned man.[6] Absence of poetic talent is a great blot for the learned. But to be a poet by plagiarising the works of others is the climax of infamy.[7]

Finally the authors state that those who are devoid of poetic talents and still try to please the world are trying to climb a mountain having shut the two eyes.[8]

---

1. Even the great poet Kālidāsa in his Mālavikāgnimitra recognizes the importance of this musical element in a drama and points out that this drama is divided into two-Lāsya and Tāṇḍava-by Lord Śaṅkara. cf. Māl. I, 4.
2. "Drama is imitation of life." Literature in general mirrors life. So it is absolutely essential that the poet should know the ways of the world.
3. ND, I, p. 23 verse 6.
4. The three lores according to the Jainas are grammar, logic and literature.
5. ND, p. 23, 9.
6. ND, p. 24, verse 10.
7. ND. p. 24, verse 11.
8. ND. p. 24, verse 12.

Critical Observation :

These introductory verses are rather significant in the sense that they reveal our authors' attitude towards the essence of Poetry. The first verse which is in praise of the Jaini Vāk and is taken from the Kārikā shows their devotion to Jainism. This verse is explained at great length by the authors themselves.[1]

The next verse points out that the authors have studied many dramas of the great poets and have themselves written some. It is on basis of a perusal of these great works of the great poets that the authors describe Nāṭya. Here debt to great writers of the past is acknowledged. That the authors have gone through a number of works – almost all the prominent works of the day – is also evident from the numerous references to and quotations from the various sources. The authors seem to be well conversent with these.

Over and above this Rāmacandra has contributed some good plays of his own to Sanskrit literature, from which he quotes at a number of places. But we do not come across any play of Guṇacandra. Even in the ND all the quotations under 'Svopajña' are the compositions of Rāmacandra only and it is quite likely that Guṇacandra who was rather of sobre nature did not write any independent play at all. The verb in dual appears only to point out the joint authorship.

It is evident on a comparative study of the ND and earlier works on dramaturgy that the authors of the ND have carefully gone through earlier literature on the subject, especially the NS of Bharata This is quite essential also, particularly while writing a book of scientific nature. They, therefore, aptly remark in the Vṛtti that they have fully scrutinized the work of the early sage i. e. Bharata. The DR, also, in utmost modesty states – Who can give new definitions of the types of plays ? I merely state briefly or summarize what has been already said.[2]

Verse 3 points to the difference between Drama (Nāṭya) and Kathā etc. Here the superiority of Nāṭya is shown to other forms of literature. Nāṭya is chiefly concerned with the development of Rasa while Kathās etc. are concerned with poetic narration made striking by various figures of word and sense. The authors are not unjustified in holding this view. If we look at the celebrated Kathās and Ākhyāyikās, like Kādambarī, Harṣacarita, Daśakumāracarita, etc., we shall at once find that the authors have been far carried away in showing off their pedantry in the

1. ND, pp. 24-25.
2. Cf. DR 1, 4 cd.

form of poetic fancies and figures so much so that the natural flow of the story is considerably hampered and lost sight of. The poet goes on describing a particular thing, sitting on the wings of fancy and imagination, in great detail leaving the plot to take care of itself.

This type of description has little scope in a drama. In drama the plot should not overshadow the sentiment, Of course, there are many other points in which the two differ. The very treatment or handling of the plot, the style, the language, etc, of a drama are totally different from those of other types of literature. Here the characters are delineated through their speeches and actions and the play-wright aims at developing a particular Rasa by means of these characters especially the hero and the heroine, situations, speeches, gestures etc.[1] Thus the essential difference between drama and other forms of literature is that in drama it is the sentiment that predominates while in the latter the poetic descriptions.

In verse 4 the authors point out the essential requirements of a person who wants to write a drama or stage it. First he must be well-versed in the science of singing, music and dancing. All these three known as Saṁgīta[2] form a very essential feature of a drama. A playwright should know this well as music is a means of ecstatic delight which is the chief purpose of a drama.[3]

Drama is called "the imitation of life." So a poet depicts life in a drama and that is why it touches our heart. The poet takes instances, situations and characters from life. So it is very necessary that he should be conversant with the ways of the world.[4]

Even the actor should have this knowledge. If he does not know singing, music, etc., he cannot act. His gesticulation or acting too will be imperfect if he has not observed the actual ways of the world. He cannot faithfully reproduce what the poet wants to convey.

Verses 6 and 7 are in praise of Rasa. According to the Sanskrit rhetoricians, Rasa is the most important element in literature. Kāvya or any literary piece has to develop Rasa, fulfilment of which is its ultimate aim.

---

1. Vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṁyogād rasanispattiḥ- NS VI.
2. Gītaṁ nṛtyaṁ ca vādyaṁ ca trayaṁ saṁgitam ucyate.
3. Cf. KP I, 2 "Sadyaḥ paranirvṛtaye."
4. That a poet should study or observe the ways of the world is stated in almost all works on rhetorics :
   cf. NS (KM), I, 116; KL V, 4; KD,I, 103; KP, I, 3 pp. 11-13.

Here in verse 6 there is a warning for the learned poets who are so much after the figures of word and sense. This has been the weak point of many Sanskrit writers, excepting a few like Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. Later writers of post-Kālidāsan age, lacking in high poetic qualities, have neglected this lucidity, simplicity and natural flow of style and sacrificed Rasa, being chiefly interested in high poetic fancies, verbal jugglaries, 'figures of words and sense', thus rendering the style most artificial and the narration as well as description far from being realistic.

Rasa is ethereal. The enjoyment of this Rasa gives such aesthetic pleasure that it is compared to the joy which the great sages feel at the time of meditation upon supreme reality viz. Brahman (Brahmānandasahodara).

The ND strictly warns such poets as are interested merely in the strikingness of word and sense that they never deserve to be called great poets. The ND boldly and emphatically asserts that dry pedants concentrating on jugglery of words and sense can never be great poets.

If these sentiments (Rasas) are unagreeable/harsh, being full of figures like pun etc., they do not please the mind like ugly ladies. In order that a lady may please the mind she should be beautiful; her complexion should be charming. External ornaments may decorate her when properly put on, but they are not all in all. Their position is subsidiary. They can decorate only when the body is charming and a charming personality will attract even without these external means[1]. This actually is the place of figures in poetry,

In this connection viz. the place of figures in a drama, the ND brings out the principle of propriety. Those, whoever they may be, from a prince to a pauper, who do not have the sense of propriety will be ridiculed by the learned.[2] Here the ND refers to a very important principle of Kāvya. Starting from Bharata all have recognised this principle of propriety. Bharata, the earliest exponent of Sanskrit drama, defines drama as an imitation of the ways of the world,[3] or representation of action of men of different natures such as Dhīrodātta and others.[4] Thus when drama is a reflection of life, it should represent it in true and appropriate colours. Ornaments or decoration, increase the charm only when put at the right places. Improper placing like putting a necklace

1 Cf. Śāk. – Kim iva hi madhurāṇām maṇḍanam nākṛtīnām (I. 19).
2 Cf. ND p. 23 v. 8.
3. Trailokyānukṛtiḥ – NS I, 107.
4. NS I, 112, 118–9.

at the foot and anklet round the neck will tend to produce laughter.[1] What is true of gold ornaments is equally true of literary ornaments i.e. figures of speech which too should occur at the right time and right place. Moreover, mere ornaments cannot decorate an ugly lady. Physical beauty too is essential. Even in poetry, therefore, Rasa which pervades the whole of the composition like the beauty in a woman, pervading the whole of her person[2], lends true charm.

The idea of propriety (Aucitya) seems to have developed gradually, and seems to have very early origin. The origin and development of Aucitya is brilliantly set forth by Dr. Raghavan in the chapter on "The History of Aucitya in Sanskrit poetics." in his 'Concepts of Alaṅkāra Śāstra'.

The next group of verses beginning from 9 to 12 is in praise of 'Kavitva' or poetic talents. To cultivate poetic talents is the chief purpose of learning and lores. Kavitva is the soul of all learning, just as beauty is for damsels. That is why even the knowers of the three lores consciously try to achieve it.[3]

The authors in these two verses point out the necessity of poetic talents for a learned man. Kavitva is to man what beauty or physical charm is to woman. Thus poetic talents seem to the ND to be the culmination of all learning. Here the ND seems to echo the view of Bhāmaha who remarks, "What use is the proficiency in speech without good poetry?"[4] It appears that there were persons who believed that writing poetry was the ultimate aim of all learning. Rāmacandra is one of those. But in fact, a learned man may not necessarily be a good poet. Poets, they say, are born and not made. For composing poetry one requires poetic talents or Pratibhā, to use the technical word, without which no poetry can ever be written and even if written will be highly ludicrous.[5]

This Kavitva is primarily an innate quality-a mental impression.[6] It is a part and parcel of one's inborn nature. It cannot be created as the charming grace in youthful damsels. Beauty in women is natural and does not depend upon any polish, or outward embellishments. Ornaments and polish may add to the beauty but cannot produce it. A lady

1. Cf. NS XXIII, 69.
2. Dhvanyāloka I, 4.
3. Cf. ND verse No. 9 page 23.
4. Vide KL, I, 4.
5. KP I. 3 Commentary.
6. KP — Saṁskāraviśeṣaḥ (p. 11).

who is physically ugly will not attract man though she may be loaded with ornaments. Kavitva is also an inborn natural gift of god. Learning and education may go to develop that quality but cannot create it. A learned literary man can be a good critic but not necessarily a good poet. The root of poetic composition is that extraordinary Pratibhā which is so natural to great poets.[1]

There has been a variety of opinions regarding what actually is the cause of poetic composition - Pratibhā or Vyutpatti (knowledge). Ānandavardhana attributes greater importance to Pratibhā. He says, 'The fault of a poet arising out of lack of knowledge is not noticed being concealed by Pratibhā, while the fault arising out of lack of the poetic talents is revealed instantaneously.'[2] Some believe in knowledge and our authors indirectly seem to share this view as they belive that every learned man must be a good poet. How far the ND is justified here is left to the discretion of the learned critics. But probably the authors mean to advise the learned people to write poetry, as the ND thinks that lack of poetic talents is a blot on a well-read person. One must start writing as there are no means of recognising whether or not a person has the talents. In this connection the view of Daṇḍin deserves to be noted. Even though he believes in a synthesis of natural genius, learning and practice, he states - "Even if a person may not be having that firm association of ideas or surprising genius due to merit, yet constant practice and learning will surely produce some good results." (Lit. Goddess Sarasvatī constantly worshipped will show favour unto him).[3] Our authors have this practical view in mind when they insist on poetic composition for a learned man. The reason too is obvious. Poetic composition is the real means of acquiring public love and permanent fame. They announce, "Those who are devoid of poetic talents and still try to gratify the world climb the mountain having closed their eyes"[4], meaning thereby that to gratify people without poetic ability is as difficult as climbing a mountain with closed eyes

Here the ND gives a warning note against plagiarism. This craze for winning popularity and fame is likely to lead a man of inferior calibre to write even by plagiarising from the works of other learned poets like Kālidāsa, Bāṇa and others. But to be a poet one must possess the power of original thinking. Not to write is bad but to write having plagiarised from other poems is the "Climax of

1. Cf. Dhvanyāloka I, 6
2 Cf. Dhvanyāloka, p 169.
3. Kāvyādarśa I, 104.
4. ND p. 24 verse 12.

infamy "[1]. The authors of the ND seem to echo here Bhāmaha who states, "Not being a poet does not conduce to sin, sickness or punishment; but being a bad poet (Kukavi) is directly tantamount to death "[2]. Plagiarism seems to have been a social disease from time to time and so we find many a critic condemning it. This problem has been exhaustively treated by Rājaśekhara in his Kāvyamīmāṁsā.

Benedictory Verse

The work opens with a benedictory verse[3], in accordance with the general tradition, in praise of the favourite deity of the poet so that the deity may confer blessings on the writer as well as the reader and dispel evils and obstacles on the path of completion of the work.

The deity propitiated here is the 'speech of the Jinas'. The authors call it to be the fit and favourite deity. The propitiation of speech in the beginniug of such a work is quite common. We find speech praised in many works on rhetorics.[4] Speech being the deity presiding over all literature, is the fittest goddess for a work on poetics. The praise of 'speech' indirectly implies the praise of the whole work-the language and its meaning.

But the authors here propitiate not merely Vāk or speech but Jainī vāk i.e. speech of the Jinas or Tīrthaṅkaras. "We perpetually propitiate the speech of the Jinas, which results in the attainment of the fourfold object of human life and which holds the universe in the righteous path having permeated it by twelve forms."[5]

The Jainī Vāk can be taken as the speech of the Jinas i.e. self-controlled or unbiased persons Verily indeed it is an unbiased mind that can create and give universal definitions. So the authors indirectly praise the speech of the great sages like Bharata.

The aim of literature is, as our authors have pointed out,[6] the attainment of fourfold objects of human life viz , Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. The dramatists obviously have the above four in mind. For instance, the hero is depicted to be struggling for material prosperity (Artha) or fulfilment of love (Kāma) or at times for moral or spiritual

1. ND p. 24, verse 11 cd.
2. Kāvyālaṅkāra I, 12.
3. ND I, 1, p. 24.
4. Cf, KD, KP, KS, and others.
5. ND I, 1,
6. Cf. Caturvargaphalāṁ - ND I, 1. Here the ND seems to have followed Bhāmaha (Cf. Dharmārthakāmamokṣeṣu KL I, 2) and disagrees with Dhanika who quotes the view of Bhāmaha, criticizes it and establishes Rasa alone as the fruit of literature. (Cf. DR : Avaloka on I. 6.)

gain (Dharma). Even when direct spiritual object is not seen the poets indirectly suggest it by delineating the victory of virtuous characters such as Rāma and the disaster of vicious characters such as Rāvaṇa, which ultimately suggests that one should behave like Rāma and not like Rāvaṇa. (It will be clear on perusal of dramatic literature that the method of preaching of the poet is quite different from the method of religious preachers. The writer does not give sermons like a priest but creates characters and situations from our daily life and thus indirectly suggests the ultimate purpose.)

Mokṣa i.e. spiritual freedom or beatitude can also be included in the purpose as it is the final aim of Dharma and even of human life. According to Hindu ideology summum bonum of human life is salvation or Mokṣa-freedom from the cycle of birth and death. The practice of Dharma ultimately conduces to Mokṣa. So Mokṣa can be called the purpose of a play[1], even though it is difficult to find dramas which directly aim at Mokṣa.

The ND emphasises that the dramas must aim at the attainment of the above fourfold object of human life.[3]

Critical Observations :

In praising the 'Jainī Vāk' in the verse of benediction the authors have strictly followed their religious preceptor Hemacandra who too in the beginning of his KS invokes the 'Jainī Vāk'[3]. Though Hemacandra takes the word in a purely religious sense the ND goes a step further and interprets it doubly as the speech of the self-controlled sages such as Bharata and others.

The verse establishes the total number of Rūpakas as twelve. In recognizing the number twelve the authors of the ND have followed their preceptor Hemacandra. But here they have attributed religious significance to the number twelve by associating it with the total number of their principal Āgama scriptures (Aṅgas). The idea of attributing religious significance to the number must have been suggested to our

1. Cf, ND p. 25 Lines 1-2.
2. ND. p. 25, line 3.
3. It should be pointed out here that ND's attitude is purely religious. While propounding fourfold object of human life as the purpose of drama *Rāmacandra* has ignored here the most important aspect of it viz., the aesthetic aspect. The purpose of literature is the instantaneous highest bliss or aesthetic delight - Sadyahparanirvṛti in the words of Mammaṭa. Dharma or preaching may be there but should be indirect, subordinate to joy. In fact, good poetry without moral is superior to bad poetry with moral.

authors by Dhanañjaya who associates the number ten of the Rūpakas with the ten incarnations of Lord Viṣṇu (DR. I. 2).

The drama culminates in the attainment of some fruit such as Dharma, Artha, Kāma or Mokṣa. Usually the drama culminates in fulfilment of love (Kāma).

The authors of the ND seem to believe that literature should convey some moral. Thus they stand not for 'Art for Art's sake' but for 'Art for morality'. True art can never be immoral. It is a dubious problem as to what the place of morality is in literature. It is true that the work of a poet is different from that of a preacher. Even if a poet preaches, he does it indirectly through suggestion. The advice given is like that of a loving wife who makes her husband do what she likes in such a way that the latter is all the while feeling that it is his will that dominates. Authors of the ND seem to differ slightly from rhetoricians like Mammaṭa and others who consider aesthetic delight as the principal aim of literature and uphold that "Preach it may, please it must."

Subject-matter of the ND

Now the ND proclaims the subject intended to be defined and discussed. The subject under discussion is the particular form of Poetry which can be represented on the stage, i.e. drama or dramatic composition, in accompaniment with its different aspects such as sentiment, state, hero, heroine etc.

The authors reserve their right as to what they should define and what they should not. The field of discussion being too vast the authors will discuss only those things in which they believe and accordingly they do not define Saṭṭaka etc., which are defined by Kohala.[1]

Again the things to be defined here are already well known being defined by ancient sages (like Bharata) and accepted by the successors. The opponent may ask then as to what is the purpose of writing whatever

1. Kohala has been mentioned by the NS as one of the hundred sons of Bharata (NS (KM) I, 26.) Even in the concluding chapter Bharata brings out that the rest will be discussed by Kohala. Cf, NS (KM)XXXVII, 18.

Kohala has been associated with dramaturgy, especially with music and dance Kallinātha in his commentary on Saṅgitaratnākara gives very long quatations from Kohala. He is recognised to be the author of 'Tālādhyāya.' Mārkaṇḍeya in his Prakrit Grammar refers to him along with Śākalya, Bharata and others. Thus his name is associated with Prakrit also and so he is said to have defined Saṭṭaka (which is totally in Prakrit) also. There is a mention of a work called Dattila-kohaliya which is suppossed to include the lectures delivered by Kohala to Dattila. Abhinava refers to him as an actor.

has been already written. The authors retort that though the matter is old, their method is not so. They do not propose to repeat or echo verbatim whatever is already written. Their intention is to put the same thing in a new form with various modifications such as elucidating what is difficult and curtailing what is unimportant.

Personal Observations ;

The authors of the ND are very clear in the assertion of their motive. They know their limitations. The subject of dramaturgy has been so thoroughly treated in all possible aspects by Bharata and others that there can be little scope for a new writer to contribute anything which can be called purely original Nor does the ND claim it. The work of the ND is therefore to put the old thing in a new light. The NS is so voluminous and consists of many things which are not necessary for a dramatist to know. It treats of such topics such as theatre-building which are not important for a young dramatist. At the same time it is also quite likely that some points might have been treated very briefly by the earlier writers. Take for instance the DR whose treatment at times is so brief that it becomes almost unintelligible. The work of the ND is to examine these works and present a lucid study, elucidating some points or curtailing them as necessity demands.

The Number of Rūpakas :

The ND enumerates the types of Rūpakas to be defined. They are twelve in number : (1) Nāṭaka, (2) Prakaraṇa, (3) Nāṭikā, (4) Prakaraṇikā, (5) Vyāyoga, 6) Samavakāra, (7) Bhāṇa, (8) Prahasana, (9) Ḍima, (10) Aṅka or Utsṛṣṭikāṅka, (11) Īhāmṛga and (12) Vīthī.

Out of these twelve, Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa are principal, as they delineate the life of a great man, which is so illuminating, and wherein all the four ends of human life are found fulfilled.[1] First four of the above twelve Rūpakas are possessed of all the five Saṁdhis and are fit for introducing Viṣkambhaka and Praveśaka. The characters are high and elevated. They can have all the four Vṛttis some one as principal and others as subordinate. The remaining eight (nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) have one or more of the three Vṛttis excluding Kaiśikī.[2] (Bhāratī, Sāttvatī and Ārabhaṭī). In Vyāyoga, Samavakāra, Īhāmṛga and Ḍima there is no one specified Vṛtti as principal while Bhāṇa, Prahasana, Aṅka and Vīthī have a specific Vṛtti as principal. In the former case, any can be made principal according to the sweet will of the author and the rest subordinate if at all they are to be used. In the latter case one is

1. ND p. 26.
2. Cf. NS XVIII, 9 ab. Here ND has strictly followed NS,

principal; the others, if at all to be employed, are to be given a subordinate position. Kaiśiki is totally prohibited here.[1]

In Samavakāra, amorous sentiment is present but not the Kaiśikī.[2] The ND explains that Śṛṅgāra as a sentiment does not imply simply passion. It requires the high development of amour (Vilāsa)[3]. This cannot be depicted in characters of furious temperament which is the case in Samavakāra. Thus there can be no Kaiśikī in Samavakāra.

The ND here differs from the general view. It has made bold to introduce two new forms of drama into the celebrated group of ten recognised by almost all Sanskrit writers on dramaturgy. Bharata, the highest and the oldest extant authority on dramaturgy speaks of ten types of Rūpaka, although he mentions Nāṭikā and defines it. The DR also speaks of ten Rūpakas which form the subject matter of the work.

The idea of twelve forms seems to be suggested to the authors of the ND by Hemacandra, their preceptor, who in his KS refers to the number as twelve by adding Nāṭikā and Saṭṭaka to the list of ten.[4] The ND substitutes Saṭṭaka by Prakaraṇikā.[5] The idea of associating the number of Rūpakas with twelve Aṅga texts of the Jain canonical literature might have been suggested to the authors of the ND, as already pointed out, by the DR where the number 'ten' is associated with the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. Still however, it would not be correct to say that the Jainas were the first to recognise the total number of Rūpakas as twelve. Originally Bharata seems to have suggested this by adding "Nāṭisaṁjñāśrite Kāvye."[6] Dhanika also refers to Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇikā in the commentary.[7] The SP clearly accepts the number of the Rūpakas as twelve adding Nāṭikā and Saṭṭaka to the list of the DR. Someśvara recognizes totally 13 types of Rūpakas [eleven of Bharata (i. e. ten +

1. DR differs here. It points out that the Vṛtti in Vithī is Kaiśikī, while in Samavakāra Kaiśikī is there but in a subordinate manner. The ND has strictly followed the NS here.
2. Cf. Abhi. II, p. 411, lines 2-3 where he points out that Kaiśikī is not there in Samavakāra.
3. This view of ND is also corroborated by the etymological meaning of Śṛṅgāra which is explained as Śṛṅgām kāmasya parāṁ kāṣṭhāṁ ṛcchati (gacchati) iti śṛṅgāraḥ, which denotes high development of love. The SD interprets the word Śṛṅga as "spring of love or sexual desire" (III, 183).
4. Vide KS Vol. I, p. 432.
5. The authors of the ND mention Saṭṭaka as the first variety of the other forms of drama, and explain it in Vṛtti. (Vide ND, p. 213) but do not seem to attach so much importance to it as to define it in Kārikā
6. NS (KM) XVIII, 109-111.
7. DR, p. 72.

Nāṭikā) + two (Troṭaka and Saṭṭaka) of Kohala]. The KS has followed the SP.

Here the authors of the ND have partly followed their learned preceptor (or the SP of Bhoja) in so far as they have recognized the total number as twelve. But they differ from both in not accepting Saṭṭaka (as Rūpaka) and replacing it by Prakaraṇikā.

The authors of the ND do not allot Saṭṭaka a place among the twelve Rūpakas probably for the following reasons :

(i) It is entirely in Prakrit and hence is totally different from the rest of the plays which are principally in Sanskrit.

(ii) In form and subject it is almost similar to Nāṭikā with only minor differences[1] and so does not have notable special features of its own.

(iii) It has not been recognized by the old sages like Bharata.

Thus according to the authors of the ND Saṭṭaka is not fit to be included in the list of the twelve principal Rūpakas though they mention it first in the list of other Rūpakas[2] which is very probably due to their respect for their preceptor as well as Bhoja who mention it among the principal Rūpakas.

How far our authors are justified in recognizing Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇikā as two of the principal Rūpakas will be discussed later on.

Nāṭaka :

The ND now starts defining the first and the most important of the twelve Rūpakas, viz., Nāṭaka[3]. It represents the life of a reputed king of antiquity. This reputation may be of three types : by name, by action and by country.[4]

The hero should be a man of the past. If he belongs to the present age, all his limitations or weaknesses also are known to people and so possibly his life may not interest people. Similarly one cannot think about the life of the would-be great men.

The hero should be a king and hence a Kṣatriya; thereby he should be a mortal and not a heavenly being. One of the purposes of a drama is to instruct. The drama of Rāma, for instance, points out that we should behave like Rāma and not like Rāvaṇa.[5] But, gods attain the

1. Vide Karpūramañjarī I, 6.
2. ND, p. 213.
3. ND I, 5.
4. Here ND follows Abhi., even the illustration of Vatsarāja is taken from Abhi. Cf. Abhi. II, p. 411.
5. Cf. KP, I, 2, p. 10.

desired objects merely by the desire and so their lives cannot be imitated by the mortals. They cannot instruct us nor impress us deeply. The ND criticises those who allow a god to be the hero. A heroine, on the other hand, can be a goddess as her character is subordinate to the hero. In Samavakāra etc., where there is nothing to instruct even a god can figure as a hero.

While depicting the life of the hero the poet does not always strictly follow the actual happenings. He may add something interesting and may as well omit things which cannot evoke any interest.

The aim is the fulfilment of one or more of the four ends of human life. These objects are attained immediately and not in future as promised in sacred texts.

It must be possessed of 'Acts', Artha-prakṛtis, Avasthās and Sandhis. It may have a god in a subordinate position. A god can figure as the helpmate of the hero or as a Patākā nāyaka or Prakarī-nāyaka. The introduction of gods in a subordinate position is also meant to make the audience realize that gods do help their true votaries.

Etymology of Nāṭaka :

The ND derives the word Nāṭaka from √Nāṭ (10 p.) 'to please', 'to make dance,' so called as it makes the hearts of spectators dance by providing great delight. It criticises Abhinava who derives the word from √Naṭ which means 'to bow down,' pointing out that in that case there will not be lengthening of the first vowel and the word formed would be Naṭaka and not Nāṭaka as we get Ghaṭa (and not Ghāṭa) from the root Ghaṭ.

Distinction Between Nāṭaka and Other Forms of Literature :

Now the ND goes to differentiate Nāṭaka from other forms of literature. Nāṭaka differs from Kathā and the like. Though both delight the minds the latter cannot be so delightful as the Nāṭaka for they do not have the charming varieties of Acts, Saṁdhis, etc. It also differs from the other types of drama such as Prakaraṇa and others as in the former the dramatist has to delineate the king and his vast paraphernalia such as ministers, commanders-in-chief, etc. while in Prakaraṇa and others, the field is comparatively limited.[1]

The ND has very effectively argued out as to why a god should not figure as the hero in a Nāṭaka[2] Here the authors have indirectly

1. ND, p. 28.
2. ND, p. 27.

emphasised the importance of 'realism' in drama without which a piece is bound to fall flat upon the minds of the spectators.

The authors of the ND have given fresh etymology of Nāṭaka in deriving it from 'Nāṭ' to make dance, which is, in fact, a causal form of 'Naṭ' to dance.[1] This criticism by the authors of the ND is based on grammatical intricacy and reveals the authors' knowledge of grammar.

Dhanika derives the word 'Nāṭya' from the root 'Naṭ' denoting movement (Avaspandana)[2]. The root 'Naṭ' should be taken in the sense of gesticulation or imitation as drama is principally a mimetic art.

HERO

Now the ND takes up the topic of different types of the hero :

The heroes can be divided into four types from the point of view of their nature.

(1) *Dhīroddhata* - (haughty)

He is unsteady, furious, arrogant, imposter or a hypocrite and boastful. Gods belong to this type.

(2) *Dhīrodātta* (exalted) :

He is very serious, just, powerful, forgiving and steady. Ministers and leaders of the armies belong to this type.

(3) *Dhīralalita* (light-hearted) :

He is amorous, fond of art, happy and tender at heart or by nature.

(4) *Dhīraśānta* (calm) :

One who has no pride, who is merciful, modest and just, is known to be Dhīraśānta. Banias and Brahmins belong to this type.

The Kings can belong to any of the four types.

There can be exceptions to the rule. Though born a Brahmin, a man like Paraśurāma may be of Dhīroddhata nature.

The ND has followed the NS.[3] But the ND differs from the NS on one point, viz, according to the NS the kings are of Dhīralalita type, while the ND opines that they can belong to any of the four types.

It is not quite clear what Bharata actually means when he says that kings are of Dhīralalita type. The ND very cleverly charges Bharata with self-contradiction, viz.. on one side Bharata states that the kings

1. The word Naṭ denotes many senses : (i) to dance, (ii) to act (iii) to injure - while its causal form Nāṭayati (-te) means to act, to gesticulate or to imitate.
2. Vide DR : Avaloka, p. 3.
3. NS (Gos) XXIV, 18

are Dhīralalita while on the other he ordains that the hero of a Nāṭaka is Dhīrodātta as well as a king.[1] This clearly means that the kings are Dhīrodātta.

The ND goes a step forward. Can the kings not be of Dhīroddhata or Dhīraśānta nature also? The ND says, "Yes". A king like Bhīma is reputed for his Uddhata nature and we do have dramas like Madhyama Vyāyoga and others having Bhīma as the hero. Similarly Kṣatriya princes like Buddha and Mahavīra are evidently of Dhīraśānta nature. Thus Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra appear to be fully justified when they declare that kings can belong to any of the four types.

In fact, Bharata's classification of heroes into four types such as Uddhata, Lalita etc. and attaching these types to gods, kings and others respectively does not seem to be quite scientific. Bharata states that a minister or a commander-in-chief are 'Udātta'. At the same time a Brahmin or a Bania is supposed to be 'Śānta'. Is a minister not a Brahmin or a Bania? A commander of an army is also either a Brahmin or a Kṣatriya. Thus the classification suffers from the fallacy of overlapping division.

The most important of all the characters in any literary piece are the hero and the heroine, and Indian rhetoricians have taken great pains to delineate them fully from top to toe. The theorists demand that the hero who is termed Nāyaka must have particular qualities. He must be brave, noble, dignified, pure, learned, virtuous, self-controlled, intelligent and having handsome personality.[2]

The ND here criticises the view of those who hold that the hero of a Nāṭaka must be of Dhīrodātta type only. The ND opines that they do not comply with the theory of the sage (i. e. Bharata) nor have they been supported by the actual practice, as we find, in some of the Nāṭakas, the heroes of Dhīralalita type also. The dramas in view of the authors of the ND are likely to be the Svapnavāsavadatta and the like, whose hero is Udayana who is recognized as a Dhīralalita type of hero. The criticism seems to have been directed against Dhanañjaya and Dhanika who think that the hero should be Dhīrodātta[3] and the authors of the

1. NS (GOS) XVIII, 10
2. For qualities of the hero : vide DR II, 1-2.
3. It is clear beyond any shadow of doubt that the ND is referring here to the DR. Dhanika in his commentary to the DR (III, 22, 23) points out that the hero of a Nāṭaka should be of Dhīrodātta type (p. 70). It is difficult to comprehend why the ND says that these persons are misinterpreting Bharata. In fact Bharata specifically points out that the hero of Nāṭaka should be known and Udātta (NS (GOS) XVIII, 10). The real stand of the ND seems to be practical. Authors of the ND have before their mental eye, as stated above, some Nāṭakas like the Svapnavāsavadattaṁ of Bhāsa whose hero is Dhīralalita instead of Dhīrodātta.

ND seem to be perfectly justified here, in so far as the actual dramatic practice goes against their opponents' view.

PLOT

Plot is of two types - (1) Principal and (2) Subordinate.

Principal is one which pervades the entire play and whose development and culmination is the main object of the playwright.

Subordinate plot or incidental plot is popularly known as sub-plot. It is subordinate as it follows the main plot. It is called Prāsaṅgika as it is introduced by way of the efforts of some one else[1].

Nothing is principal or subordinate by nature : it is the writer who makes it so. The action whose fruit is the most desired of all the fruits will be naturally understood as principal and the rest will be subordinate whose purpose is to help the main fruit; e.g., in Rāma story, the bringing back of Sītā is represented to be principal and the friendship with Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa, killing of Rāvaṇa, etc. are represented as subordinate as they are means for the attainment of the above principal end.

The poet (i.e. the dramatist) is not absolutely free to make a thing principal or otherwise. He has to observe the *propriety*[2]. Whatever fruit is the most appropriate to the nature of the hero should be made principal, e.g., in the TPV the efforts of Yaugandharāyaṇa form Prāsaṅgika to the main thing, viz., the attainment of the kingdom of Kauśāmbī.

The Sub-plot is essential only when the hero requires external aid to accomplish his end, and not always, e.g., in the Kośalikā Nāṭikā the hero needs no help in obtaining Kośalikā and hence no sub-plot.

From another point of view the plot may be divided into four types : 1) Sūcya (to be suggested), 2) Prayojya (to be staged), 3) Abhyūhya (to be imagined) and 4) Upekṣya (to be neglected or left out.)

(1) This is not to be actually put on the stage, as it is either dull and insipid or vulgar (though interesting such as embracing, kissing, etc.)

(2) This is to be actually staged. It should be interesting and in keeping with the refined taste.

1. Cf. Prasaṅgāt parakīyayatnāt āgataṁ prāsaṅgikaṁ, ND, p. 30.
2. Vide ND, p. 30.

(3) This can be easily imagined and is closely connected with the former two varieties of the plot, e.g., journey can be easily imagined when the person or the party is shown to arrive at the destination[1].

(4) This is so repugnant and odious. It creates shame if represented on the stage and has to be totally done away with, e.g., eating, taking bath, sleeping, answering to the nature's call, etc.

The ND makes a note here. Sometimes if this becomes necessary to be staged being an indispensable part of the plot it may be staged such as sleeping of Sītā in Rāma's lap in the UTR.

The ND now turns to another division of plot which is popularly known as *Nāṭyoktis* (conventions of speech):

Introduction :

While writing a drama, the dramatist has to face a number of difficulties. His medium is that of speech or conversation. He has to unfold the minds of the characters through their speeches and actions. He has also to bear in mind the stage and the audience as the drama is primarily meant for being staged. This creates a number of problems. The entry and exit of characters have got to be made dramatic. When once a character has entered the stage, it is not possible to remove it suddenly without proper reasons. Moreover, the character might be required on the stage soon afterwards. It may also happen that in order that the audience may fully comprehend a particular character it is necessary for the latter to reveal the innermost workings of his mind to the spectators, but this may not be desirable (from the point of view of the playwright) for other characters on the stage to hear as it may come in the way of the further development of the plot.

The ND considers these as "the divisions of plot" from another point of view. It divides the plot into five parts (i) Prakāśa, (ii) Svagata, (iii) Apavārita, (iv) Janāntika, and (v) Ākāśokti or Ākāśabhāṣita.

(i) *Prakāśa* (*Aloud*) – Generally all speeches are to be heard by (the spectators in the theatre and) all the characters on the stage and so this direction may sound redundant. It is, in fact, understood where there is no other direction. It is, not mentioned by Bharata and so Prof. Balbir thinks it to have been introduced later,[2] This stage-direction is to be introduced only after 'Svagata'. The DR places it under Sarvaśrāvya.

1. For instance, in the Śāk, the journey of Śakuntalā and her party at the end of Act IV is imagined when they arrive at the court of Duṣyanta in Act V.
2. A. I. O. C. Thirteenth session, Nagpur, 1946, p. 190.

(ii) *Svagata* (*also called Ātmagata*[1]) – When the speech is not meant to be heard by any other character on the stage it is known as Svagata. This is a sort of soliloquy in which the speaker gives free vent to his inner emotions and personal thoughts.

As a matter of fact there is no distinction between Svagata and Ātmagata (both being synonyms). But Sāgaranandin takes the two terms differently, and recommends the use of Tripatākākara in either.[2] But the distinction between the two is not explained. On the basis of the Anargharāghava I, p. 48 Prof. Levi has wrongly tried to distinguish between the two.[3] The explanation of Prof. Balbir too viz., "Ātmagata is the word that is yet in the character and Svagata that which is to be heard by that character alone who speaks it out." is also far from being plausible.

(iii) *Apavārita* (*or Apavāritaka or Apavārya*) – When a secret is disclosed to another having turned aside from all others who are not expected to hear and having bent the body before the person to whom the matter is to be revealed it is known as Apavārita. It is so called since the matter is to be concealed from many.[4] Here the two characters come forward to a corner of the stage and talk.[5]

(iv) *Janāntika* – When the matter is to be concealed from only one character while others on the stage may hear it the above stage-direction should be used. This is to be suggested by a technical sign of the hand called Tripatākā [6]

It is so called as the speech is to be concealed from only one while it may be revealed to others.[7] In explaining this the ND has strictly followed Abhinava.[8]

If we look to the actual use of the terms Janāntika and Apavārita by the dramatists in their plays we shall find that there is much confu-

---

1. Cf. NS. (KM) XXV, 89.
2. Vide NLR – Svagatam ātmagatam caiva svayam tripatākāpāṇinā, yet pathet tatra somyojyam dvayam etat prayoktṛbhiḥ. (p 95)
3. Le Theatre Indien notes to p. 61.
4. Apavāryate Bahūnām Pracchādyata Ityapavāritam–ND, p. 31.
5. Cf. DR. p. 33.
6. Here all the three fingers (of the hand) except the ring-finger (Anāmikā) are kept straight while the ring-finger together with the thumb are kept bent or curved – ND p. 31.
7. ऊर्ध्वसर्वाङ्गुलिर्वक्रानामिकः करस्त्रिपताकः सोऽन्तरमश्राव्यं प्रति व्यवधानं यत्रान्येन सह अल्पो जनानामेकस्यैव गोप्यत्वाद् बहुनामन्तिकं श्राव्यतया निकटं जनान्तिकम् । ND. p. 28।.
8. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 281.

sion and ambiguity and arbitrariness in the employment of these terms.[1] One and the same dramatist uses Apavārya at one place and Janāntika at another even though the situations are quite similar. On the other hand a dramatist like Harṣa does not employ the term Janāntika at all in his plays.

The purpose of Tripatākākara seems to be quite practical. How is the audience going to know whether the speech is Apavārita or Janāntika? Turning aside (Parāvṛtti) may go to bring out this distinction to some extent. Tripatākākara is a sure sign to distinguish Janāntika from other speeches.

Professor R. D. Karmarkar has tried to bring out the difference as under :

According to him in Apavāritaka, other characters on the stage are entitled to hear the speech, barring those from whom the speaker has turned away. In Janāntika, the persons on the stage are excluded by Tripatākākara. He interprets Anyonyāmantraṇa thus : "It must be addressed to a particular person by name, and the speech must be replied by the person addressed, who also has to address the first by name.[2] But here he does not seem to have taken Abhinava's remark (and the NS) into consideration.

(v) *Ākāśabhāṣita* - Here there is only one character on the stage. The character employing this device addresses another imaginary person who is not on the stage and himself puts the questions and answers them. At times the question is put as though it was put by another person while at times the answer to the question put by the character, is given in such a way as it came from some one else.[3] The obvious purpose of this device is a practical one, viz., the economy of characters.[4]

The ND reckons this to be another division of plot. The DR too gives this as a division of plot.[5] The BP divides the plot into two -

1. Cf. "The Apavārita speech in Sanskrit Drama" by N. B. Purohit.
2. Annals of B. O. R. I., 1954 : "The Dramatic Terms", pp. 127-28.
3. ND., p. 32.
4. Cf. Anargh., p. 12.
5. DR I, 63.

Vastu

Sarvaśrāvya (Prakāśa) | Niyataśrāvya | Aśrāvya (Svagata)

Niyataśrāvya: Janāntika | Apavārita.

(1) Śrāvya and (2) Aśrāvya. The former is subdivided into Sarvaśrāvyā and Niyataśrāvya, the latter being further subdivided into Janāntika and Apavārita. The RS also accepts the above division substituting the word Prakāśa for Śrāvya and Svagata for Aśrāvya.[1]

The Nāṭyoktis are highly important in a drama from the point of view of its representation on the stage. It is true that each character on the stage has to speak loud enough that a person sitting in the remotest corner of the auditorium may be able to hear him but very often the dramatist has to face certain practical difficulties. Generally the characters on the stage talk among themselves. This is the usual dialogue form in which a drama is written. Nevertheless at times the occassion demands that the speech of a particular character is not expected to be heard by other characters on the stage nor is it possible to dispose of the characters who are not expected to hear. At such a juncture the stage-direction Svagata is used. Here the character is soliloquising i e. thinking to himself. The character in this case generally moves forward to a corner on a stage leaving other characters behind. Sometimes the speech of the character is meant to be heard only by one character and not by others. The character to whom the matter is to be reported secretly is drawn on one side of the stage and the person turns his back against those who are to be excluded. Here the play-wright uses the stage-direction Apavārya. Sometimes it happens that the speech may be heard by all other characters except one. This creates a practical difficulty namely, how the audience is to understand as to which of the characters is not supposed to hear the speech. In Apavārita the matter is to be concealed from all but one and so the two characters can come on one side of the stage and talk, which would clearly go to suggest that the remaining characters are not supposed to hear the talk, but here the case is quite different. There is only one character from whom the talk is to be concealed. Should then that character be asked to clear out silently from the stage ? But the presence of the character may be quite necessary on the stage and after a few moments the character will have to enter the stage again.

This type of sudden entry and exit is highly unnatural and defective from the dramatic point of view. Bharata has prescribed definite rules for entry and exit of characters. The characters cannot enter and leave the stage unnoticed. The character abruptly leaving the stage is bound to put the audience in a state of confusion. Similarly an abrupt entry of the character would naturally disturb the natural flow of conversation

1. RS, p. 284.

going on at that time. To remove this technical difficulty the dramatist uses the stage-direction, Janāntika. Here a special sign called Tripatākākara is to be made by the speaker with reference to the character which is to be excluded. When this sign is made the learned audience will automatically understand that a particular character is not supposed to hear this.

Generally, the speeches are to be heard by all characters on the stage and so the stage-direction - 'Prakāśa' is understood. This direction is specially used when it is preceded by the stage-direction, Svagata.

The discussion on Ākāśabhāṣita also suggests that there should not be too many characters on the stage. Only those who have a definite role to perform in the development of the plot should be allowed to come on the stage. The remaining may only be suggested. For effecting this economy ot characters, the stage-direction Ākāśabhāṣita becomes useful.

Most of the writers on dramaturgy ordain Tripatākākara for Janāntika, but no body elucidates as to why that sign should be used in Janāntika only. The DR seems to be inaccurate when it defines Janāntika as mutual speech having brushed other characters aside by Tripatākākara. In this case the difference between Janānkika and Apavārita becomes indistinct. In fact, Tripatākākara can be practically directed to only one particular person (or at the most a group of two or three). Here the view of the ND seems to be more plausible.

The DR's division of the plot into three types, viz., (i) Śrāvya, (ii) Aśrāvya and (iii) Niyataśrāvya, cannot include another special important variety which is known as Ākāśabhāṣita and the DR has to treat it separately. The ND seems to be a bit more systematic when it divides the plot into five types as stated above. It is quite natural that these five varieties of plot later on bear the appelation of Nāṭyokti as they are more truly the varieties of dramatic speech rather than of the plot. They are, in fact, the stage-directions which are primarily meant for the actors.

The ND does not introduce the word Nāṭyokti probably because it believes in giving the least number of technical words which go to make at times even simple things complicated and difficult to understand. This view is corroborated when we find other instances too, where the ND purposefully avoids the technical words.

After discussing the various divisions of plot, the ND now proposes to discuss what an ideal plot should consist of.

The plot of a drama should mostly comprise of prose as it is in prose that the sense or import is easily caught. The prose should be short and sweet. The prose may at times be intermingled with simple and elegant verses in limited number. The prose should not be clumsy and full of long compounds.[1]

Various incidents which bear affinity with the main story are to be introduced. They should go to develop the plot, i. e. help the attainment of fruit, e.g., entry of a monkey in the RTN, which becomes responsible for the hero obtaining the board, which sows the seed of love; or in the Satya., the fight between Kāpālika and Vidūṣaka, which is responsible for the falling down and exposure of the picture of Damayantī.

The descriptions of oceans, the sun, the moon, seasons, morning, mountains, amorous sports, etc, are not to be introduced just to satisfy the itch of poetic composition.[2] Even if the description has some purpose it is to be given very briefly in a stanza or two, since more of description interrupts the natural flow of sentiment.

There should be only one sentiment as principal, the others ought to be subordinate. At the end there should be Adbhuta resulting from the acquisition of some extraordinary fruit. The Love or the Heroic or the Furious ultimately results in achieving an excellent damsel or land or destruction of enemies. In the absence of some extraordinary object in view, what is the use of taking the trouble of employing various means ?

Sentiment is undoubtedly a very important element of the drama, but in being too much after it one should not interrupt the easy flow of the story. The various figures of speech, Sandhyaṅgas, other subordinate Rasas, etc. are also to be employed in such a way as they may not hinder the principal sentiment but heighten it.

The thing which has already been stated once, if required to be re-stated, should be whispered in the ear of the character to whom it is to be told together with the stage-direction "Karṇe". This is in order to avoid the fault of repetition.

Incidents even should be like the hair on a cow's tail. Some hair in the tail are very short, some are a bit longer and reach to the middle

---

1. This was considered to be an essential feature of prose-writing. The authors like Bāṇa and Subandhu took pride that they could use pun at every syllable.

   The ND here strikes a note of warning for a dramatist that the prose of drama should be very simple and easily comprehensible.

2. Kāvyakaṇḍuvaśāt – ND, p. 32.

of the tail and a few are longer still, going up to the end. Similarly in a drama also some incidents are of short duration, some stretch upto the middle of the plot and some upto the end; e.g., in the RTN the the spring-festival occurs only in Mukha Saṁdhi, the story of Bābhravya and others which is mentioned in Mukha re-appears in the beginning of Nirvahaṇa, and the chief incidents such as the acquisition of Ratnāvalī are to be put at the end.[1]

Having fully described what ought to be introduced in the plot, the authors now go to describe what ought not to be introduced. The matter which is improper or opposed to the sentiment or the nature of the hero should be either abandoned or modified to suit the atmosphere, e.g., for a 'dhīralalita' type of hero, dalliance with another's wife is improper, while to show arrogance in him is contradictory (or opposed) to his nature. Similarly embracing, kissing, etc., on the stage is improper for Śṛṅgāra while depiction of Bībhatsa is totally opposed to it (Śṛngara). This type of impropriety or contradiction should vigilantly be removed or should be changed in such a way as it may appear quite proper, natural and concordant, e.g., in the NLV, the abandonment of one's own wife on the part of a dhīralalita hero was improper and so was represented through the introduction of the Kāpālika.

Act :

Drama is a composition in Acts (just as Mahākāvya is in Cantos). An Act is a unit of action in drama. It indicates completion of a stage (Avasthā) or a part of it according to the need of the situation. Its time-limit is not less than 48 minutes and not more than 12 hours[2]. At the end of an Act Bindu should be employed so that the two Acts may not seem to be unconnected with each other. This rule is to be followed not very literally, because at the end of the final Act of a play, or at the end of one-act plays or in a type of drama like Samavakāra where the acts are mutually unrelated, no Bindu is necessary.

1. Bharata ordains that a piece should be composed like the tip of a cow's tail. (Gopucchāgraṁ - NS XVIII, 42).

The ND's interpretation of the word agrees with the Abhi. II, p. 429. The SD mentions this as an opinion of some and offers another explanation viz., the each succeeding act should be smaller than the earlier one. But this explanation does not seem to be plausible as it is highly artificial and unreasonable to arrange the acts in such an order.

2. ND offers the justification for this time-limit. If it is shorter than 48 minutes, it would appear as an incomplete performance being too short when represented on the stage. If it is longer than 12 hours it will disturb the daily routine work and would be tiresome. Vide ND, p. 35.

The life of the hero together with its joy and suffering should be delineated therein. Whatever would interest the spectators should only be represented in the Act, other things may be suggested or may be left to conjecture or totally left out.

Here the ND criticises those who complete an Avasthā in the middle of an Act. Against whom especially the criticism is directed is not clear. It is probable that here the ND criticizes the dramatists who do not observe the above rule viz. a new Avasthā should commence with a new Act.

An act should not contain too many extra activities which are not closely connected with the main plot. It should not have too many characters. It may generally have (seven or) eight characters. The Act should not have more than ten and less than four or five characters. If there are too many characters on the stage the four-fold histrionics will not be clearly perceptible[1].

One important characteristic of Sanskrit plays is that all the characters exit at the close of an act.

Acts should not be less than five and more than ten in a Nāṭaka. The number may range from five to ten. If each Avasthā occupies one Act the total number will be five. If one stage is prolonged for one reason or the other upto more than one Act, the total number will accordingly increase. Sometimes one stage may occupy even three acts, e. g., in the Veṇī. the Garbha Sandhi (Prāptyāśā stage) spreads over three Acts (III, IV and V). In Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī we find four Acts. There one of the Acts combines two Avasthās.

There are positive restrictions laid down by the old sages as to the nature of things to be represented on the stage, e g., nowhere in the play, a fatal blow to the hero (by the enemy) should be shown. It may be shown in the case of the hero of the Patākā or Prakarī. If the blow is caused by the hero himself as in the Satya. where the hero cuts the flesh from his own self to offer it to gods, it is no fault. Similarly in the Nāg., the blow caused by Garuḍa to Jimūtavāhana who dedicated himself for the cause of another person helps in heightening the Rasa. So also in the RV the entry of Lakṣmaṇa being struck by a missile is not faulty as he is not the hero.

In place of a deadly blow, either capturing by the enemies (such as that of Udayana in the Vāsavadattānṛttavāra) or escape or alliance may be shown.

1. In a Samavakāra even though there are many characters it is not the fault as it is its special feature.

FIVE ARTHOPAKṢEPAKAS (SCENES OF INTRODUCTION)

The plot of a drama, we have already seen, is divided into four types (i) Prayojya, (ii) Sūcya, (iii) Abhyūhya and (iv) Upekṣya. Only that part of the plot which is interesting, captivating and suitable to the refined taste can be represented on the stage; that which is abhorrent and odious has to be totally omitted, but still there are certain incidents which are insipid and unstagable and yet the knowledge of which has got to be provided to the audience, in the absence of which they cannot fully comprehend and appreciate the plot and its future development. Such incidents and episodes which have got to be suggested can be made known to the audience in five ways. These are technically known as Arthopakṣepakas.

Some incidents are not stageworthy, e.g., a long journey. A short journey which occupies three to four Muhūrtas may possibly be represented on the stage, but a long one which would require more time cannot be represented on stage and has got to be suggested by Viṣkambhaka or so, as it would consist of resting, sleeping, eating, drinking and such other actions which would naturally bore the audience. Similarly, a seige around a town too cannot be staged as there are so many activities such as raising tents, carrying weapons, digging subterranean passages etc. The political revolution or decline of a kingdom in a particular country too cannot be staged as it consists of fighting and blood-shed. Amorous dalliances such as kissing, embracing, etc., too should not be staged. Here the playwright must resort to indirect suggestion such as entering a secluded place or so. Similarly, death, fight, etc., which consist of personal injury such as loss of a hand or a foot and such other things which are injurious should not be staged.[1] The events of such nature are to be suggested by the aid of 'Introductory Scenes.' They are five in number, (i) Viṣkambhaka, (ii) Praveśaka, (iii) Aṅkāsya or Aṅkamukha, (iv) Cūlikā and (v) Aṅkāvatāra.

Viṣkambhaka ;

Viṣkambhaka treats of that part of the plot which is insipid or even if it be interesting is incapable of being staged in a single day; and is thus unfit for being staged. It may be related to the past, the present or the future. It is in lucid Sanskrit or Prakrit which does not abound in long compounds. It is brief so that it may well connect the succeeding Act with the preceding one.

1. The authors here point to some exceptions. The rules are not to be blindly followed. In the Nāgānanda, for instance, Jimūtavāhana, the hero, is shown to be deprived of limbs.

Viṣkambhaka is of two types – (i) Śuddha and (ii) Saṅkīrṇa.

(i) *Śuddha.* – It is so called as it has no low characters.

It is performed by *middle* characters only, either male or female. It is in Sanskrit. Even one person can perform it by means of Ākāśokti, Svagatokti, etc. Even a female character, if she is introduced here, will speak in Sanskrit. Middle characters mean a minister, a commander-in-chief, a merchant, a Brahmin, a queen, a leader or a distinguished person, an adversory of the hero, etc.

(ii) *Saṅkīrṇa* – It comprises of middle as well as low characters. It may be in Sanskrit as well as in Prakrit as the low characters are not allowed to speak Sanskrit. Low characters consist of attendants and servants.

It can stand in the beginning of the first Act of a play after the prologue to suggest the needful things of the first Act. It may be placed in between the two Acts in order to connect them with each other.

Viṣkambhaka may be etymologically explained as follows :

It is so called since it supports (Viskabhnātı) the plot by connecting the incidents in an apt and appropriate order.[1]

Praveśaka has almost all the characteristics that have been stated with reference to Viṣkaṁbhaka. The difference is in the characters. In Viṣkaṁbhaka the characters are middle (and low also in Saṅkīrṇa) while here they all are low characters and so speak in Prakrit. These low characters are meant for accomplishing the work of the hero and have no purpose of their own.

The authors give an etymological explanation of the word Praveśaka. The word is derived from Pra + $\sqrt{\text{Viś}}$ (causal) to make enter, i.e. to introduce. Praveśaka is so called because it 'makes enter' the indirect things or matters in the heart of the spectators[2].

Here the authors quote a view of some who hold that 'Praveśaka cannot stand at the beginning of the first Act'.[3] This suggests that according to the ND it may stand even in the beginning of the first Act.

---

1. ND, p. 38, line 8.
2. ND, p. 39, line 2.
3. This is the view of Abhi. referred to as 'Kecit'. Cf. Tatra praveśako'pi prathamopakṣepe na yojya itı yuktam. (Abhı. II, p. 434.)

   But Abhinava also allows the option that it may also occur between Prastāvanā and the Act I.

Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka form a separate group of their own in these five Arthopakṣepakas. They have a good deal of similarity. Their nature is almost the same. The only important difference lies in the characters that figure therein.

They figure only in Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī, the four of the principal forms, rather more developed forms of drama. The reason is clear. These two viz, Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka are generally introduced to suggest events spread over a long duration of time and place. In the Vyāyoga and other one-act plays there is limited action as the plot itself is small, and consequently there is little scope for Praveśaka or Viṣkambhaka. Samavakāra, though it has three Acts, has its Acts mutually unconnected and so there is no need of such connecting links like introductory scenes, nor do the remaining two-Ḍima and Īhāmṛga-whose action is confined to a few days only need to introduce either of these two. They may have the remaining three, viz., Aṅkāsya, Cūlikā and Aṅkāvatāra as they are used to suggest events of shorter duration.

The authors of the ND do dot fail to give an etymological explanation too. The explanation echoes the one in the Abhinavabhāratī.[1]

The Abhi. states a view of some who hold that the low characters have no purpose of their own to serve but are for the sake of the hero, the heroine, etc. with the words-" Anye ivāhuḥ " and illustrates by 'Āṇattammi Bhaṭṭidāriyāe....etc.'[2] The same illustration and the view are repeated by the ND.

Aṅkāsya or Aṅkamukha :

When the characters at the close of the previous Act allude to the subject-matter of the succeeding Act (which is otherwise unconnected) it is called Aṅkāsya or Aṅkamukha.[3]

This is illustrated by the ND from the Vīracarita (that is, the Mahāvīracarita). At the end of Act II Sumantra announces the arrival of Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and Paraśurāma and the characters leave the stage to see them.[4] Thus the Act ends and the new Act III opens with the introduction of the sage Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and others. Thus the

1. cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 421.
2. cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 424.
3. ND I, 26, cf. DR I, 62.
4. Here the illustration is the same as DR's, pp. 32-33 and is explained in identical terms by ND.

two Acts have been mutually connected. Here the ND seems to have followed the DR.

The SD defines it differently. "It is a part of an Act which suggests the subject-matter of all the Acts and which also alludes to the central theme," e.g., in the Mālatīmādhava the dialogue between Kāmandakī and Avalokitā in the Viṣkambhaka of the Act I suggests the central theme and the subject-matter of all the Acts.[1]

Cūlikā or Cūlā :

Cūlā or Cūlikā occurs when the sense or the coming event is suggested by some characters-male or female-from behind the curtain.[2] It is called Cūlā or Cūlikā as it resembles Cūlā i. e. Śikhā in the sense that just as a person has a *Śikhā* at the back of his head so also in a play the voice comes from behind the curtain; e.g., in the Uttararāmacarita Act II, the arrival of Ātreyī is suggested by an off-stage character Vāsantikā behind the scenes with the words, "Welcome to the one who has penance for wealth (Tapodhanā)" and then enters Ātreyī.[3]

Rāmacandra gives another illustration from his own work Nalavilāsa where Śekhara, a character off the stage, suggests the entry of Kālahaṁsa by words, "Welcome to Kalahaṁsa together with his attendants."

The third illustration is given from the Ratnāvalī where the time-keeper or the bard (Bandī) behind the curtain utters a verse to the effect that the feudal kings were waiting for Udayana as the sun had set in the west. This makes Sāgarikā understand that the person whom she thought to be cupid was none else but King Udayana himself.

The definition of Cūlā agrees perfectly in sense with that of the DR.

The RS divides the Cūlikā into two - Cūlikā and Khaṇḍa-cūlikā.[4]

The significance of Cūlikā appears to be two-fold. First, Bharata ordains that no character (of importance) should enter the stage without previous introduction. A main character should be introduced to the audience without delay, otherwise the audience will not be able to understand the plot properly and that is why the playwright cleverly introduces the main character of the play immediately after the prologue with the

1. SD, p 181. Here the SD seems to have followed the NLR which defines it as Sūtraṇaṁ sakalāṅkānāṁ (p. 18). The illustration also is the same.
2. ND I, 26 cd.
3. Cf. DR, p. 32.
4. RS III, 183-187.

words of the Sûtradhâra viz., "Here is so and so...." etc. By this method not only can some of the characters be suggested but also other things pertaining to the plot. Secondly it helps the playwright in economizing on the number of characters on the stage by manipulating the voice from behind the scenes.

Aṅkāvatāra (Continuation-scene) :

When the very characters that figure in the preceding Act are also there at the opening of the following Act it is called Aṅkāvatāra. There is hardly anything to be suggested here, since there is no gap between the two Acts. Actually the Act is a continuation and is split into two so that it may not be too lengthy and lose its inherent technical unity which an Act should have.

The illustration is quoted from the Māl. of Kālidāsa. At the end of Act I, the Vidūṣaka says : "Then both of you having approached the audience-hall and having properly arranged the orchestra you may send a messenger or rather the sound of the drum itself will cause us to rise," and after these words when the sound of drum is heard the same caracters-all together-commence the new Act.[1] Thus in fact there is no gap.

Here the ND puts forward another view, of some ("Anye tu") who define Aṅkāvatāra as follows :

"It is a part of an Act in which allusion is made to the subject-matter of the following Acts and the whole plot", as is done in the Ratnāvalī, Act II, where love between Sāgarikā and Udayana, which forms the central theme of the whole play is suggested by the words - "Such an excellent girl should long for such a bridegroom only."[2]

The ND remarks that this (i. e. Aṅkāvatāra) is also known as Garbhāṅka which is "that part of an Act which alludes to the central theme of the play (Bījārtha) and which appears, when staged, like an Act within an Act".[3] The above-mentioned definition of Garbhāṅka is very much similar to (or, we may say, almost identical with) the definition of Aṅkāvatāra as given by Abhinavagupta.[4] The definition of Garbhāṅka as given by the SD also resembles the above one to a certain extent.[5]

1. Cf. DR (p. 33) gives the same illustration and explanation.
2 RTN, p. 33.
3. Cf. ND, p. 41.
4. Cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 421.
5. "Garbhāṅka is another Act which comes within an Act, which contains the seed (Bīja) as well as the fruit (Phala) and which also has Raṅgadvāra, Āmukha etc." SD VI, 20.

It appears that the definition of Abhinava which he quotes with the words 'yad uktaṁ' does not seem to be quite scientific for the simple reason, that it makes no distinction between Aṅkāvatāra and Garbhāṅka. At the same time it is not proper to equate Aṅkāvatāra with Garbhāṅka. The former is an Arthopakṣepaka whose purpose is to supply the missing links of the story. It suggests the matter which is not stageworthy. Garbhāṅka which is a play within a play has nothing to do with this.

According to the SD, it is known as Aṅkāvatāra where the new Act is introduced in continuation with (as a part of) the earlier one being suggested by the characters at the end of the act, e.g., in the Śāk. Act VI is introduced being suggested by the characters at the end of the Act V, as a part of the same.[1]

According to the NLR (p. 18) it is Aṅkāvatāra when at the end of an Act (the subject-matter of) the coming Act is briefly suggested by the dramatic speeches [2]

The above discussion goes to suggest that the notions about Aṅkāvatāra are not quite clear and unanimous.[3] On the one hand it is reckoned as simply a scene in continuation of the previous one while on the other it is called that part of the Act which makes allusion to the subject-matter (Bīja) of the following Acts. Still more confounding is the third view where it is identified with the Garbhāṅka which is an Act within an Act or a play within a play.[4]

The ND further elucidates as to when and where the different Arthopakṣepakas should be used. The first two viz., Viṣkambhaka and Praveśaka are to be employed when a long interval of time is to be suggested. When the time-duration to be suggested is small, Aṅkāsya should be used. Cūlikā is meant to suggest still smaller duration, while Aṅkāvatāra is used when the duration is extremely small or insignificant (as at the end of Act I in the Mālavikāgnimitra)[5].

1. Vide SD. VI, p. 181.
2. For further details vide present writer's paper-"The problem of Aṅkāsya and Aṅkāvatāra in Sanskrit Dramaturgy", JOI, Baroda, June 1963.
3. Cf. Dr. V. Raghavan. Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa, p. 62.
4. Dr. Jackson and Dr. Ogden have discussed in detail the use of Garbhāṅka in Sanskrit drama but have not touched this controversy between Garbhāṅka and Aṅkāvatāra. Vide Priyadarśikā (Intro.) pp. CV-CXI.
5. The ND here seems to follow Abhinavagupta who states thus - If the time-duration of a month or a year is to be suggested Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka may be introduced. If the duration is limited (Parimita) Aṅkāsya is to be employed, if it is small (Alpa) then Cūlikā and if it is the smallest i.e. insignificant (Alpatama) Aṅkāvatāra is to be used. Abhi. II, p. 422.

Critical Remarks :

The Arthopakşepakas beginning with Vişkambhaka have a great importance from the point of view of a dramatist. A dramatist must have a vigilant mind to distinguish between the matter which will be staged and that which has to be merely suggested, since all the incidents cannot be staged, some of them being practically impossible to stage. Still they cannot be omitted sometimes as they form an inevitable link in the story. This huge amount of Sūcya type of Vṛtta has to be suggested by Arthopakşepakas. In other words, to reveal to the audience the events during intervals between the Acts, the theory permits a choice of five forms of scenes of introduction.

The earliest reference to the name Arthopakşepaka is to be found in Kohala.[1] It is so called because it introduces some matter.[2] The name Arthopakşepaka does not occur in the NS of Bharata. Moreover, Bharata mentions and discusses only two of the five Arthopakşepakas, viz, Praveśaka and Vişkambhaka. In the NS (GOS Vol. III) Ch. XIX, vs. 110-116 (and in NS (KM) also) we get a discussion of the five Arthopakşepakas. But the editor points out that those seven verses are definitely an interpolation. The text of the NS is handled so roughly from time to time that it is very difficult to sort out the genuine from the spurious. These seven verses are very probably interpolated by some later writer in accordance with the view ef Kohala or the Samgrahakāra. Some of these have been suggested even by Bharata or the commentator Abhinava.[3] It is further stated that out of these, the last verse, (Number 116) is definitely from Kohola. Verse No. 115 is quoted in the Abhi. with the words - "So it is said", while commenting upon Praveśaka.[4] Verse No. 111 is also found in Kohala differing only in the fourth quarter. Abhinava in his commentary (Vol. II, p. 434) actually quotes this verse under the name of Kohala. Verse No. 112 and 114 are taken from the eighteenth chapter of Bharata's NS.[5]

This above view of the editor of the NS[6] about interpolation is again corroborated by the fact that Abhinava does not comment upon these seven verses.

1. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 421, lines 3-4.
2. Artham upakşipati iti arthopakşepakaḥ.
3. NS (GOS) Vol. III, p. 64.
4. Cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 421 lines 12-14.
5. Cf. NS (GOS) XVIII, 55 and XVIII, 33 respectively with the verses no. 112 and 114.
6. NS (GOS) Vol. III, p. 64.

The NS Ch. XVIII does treat of Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka but not quite systematically. The nature of Praveśaka is explained in XVIII, 26-30 and 33-37, intervened by the rules regarding time and place in an Act in vs. 31-32. Then the author of the NS begins to talk about other matters concerning an Act. Then comes the discussion about Prakaraṇa – its definition, the hero, the heroine, the language, etc. After this there is a discussion of Viṣkambhaka and its types, viz., Śuddha and Saṅkīrna.

This diffuse, unconnected treatment of the two of the five Arthopakṣepakas and the absence of the remaining three altogether point out that Bharata might not have had a systematic idea about the Arthopakṣepakas and probably those ideas developed later on.[1] Abhinava, in his Abhinavabhāratī on the topic of Praveśaka, treats of the subject, briefly enumerating the five Arthopakṣepakas under the name of Kohala.

The DR gives a systematic exposition of the topic considering the five Arthopakṣepakas as means of suggesting the matter which is insipid and not fit to be staged.

The ND gives a clear explanation of what things can be suggested by Arthopakṣepakas. Some details are excluded from representation for practicability, (e. g. which take long time or which can be represented with great difficulty or which are tedious and boring), some others to avoid offending the feelings of the audience and some because they may be painful and shameful. But can they be altogether dispensed with ? No. Some of them are indispensable for maintaining the continuity of the plot and the proper understanding of the events to be shown. They provide a suitable background for the coming events, without which the scenes that follow will suffer and the audience will not be able to appreciate them well. They thus form a connecting link between the two independent Acts which are separated from each other in time and place.

Out of the five the first two, viz , Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka are more important. They differ from each other in the following points :-

The Viṣkambhaka is performed by middle characters (which is Śuddha) or by the middle and inferior characters (in which case it is called Saṁkīrṇa) while the Praveśaka is carried on entirely by inferior characters. Moreover, the language of the Viṣkambhaka is Sanskrit or

1. This also finds a corroboration in the statement of Abhinava who ascribes the authorship of Arthopakṣepakas to Kohala. Abhi. II, p. 421.

mixed i. e. Sanskrit and Prakrit (when it is Saṁkīrṇa) while the latter is wholly in Prakrit. Next, Viṣkaṁbhaka may be used even in the beginning of the play while the Praveśaka is to be used only between two Acts. Usually there are not more than two characters in a Viṣkaṁbhaka, for Praveśaka there is no such rule.

Prof. Jagirdar notes another important distinction between the two. According to him, Viṣkaṁbhaka was meant for summarizing important events supposed to happen off the stage, while Praveśaka was merely a kind of scene-shift.[1]

The nature of Cūlikā is very simple. It distinguishes itself from all the rest by the fact that here the matter is to be suggested by some character from 'behind the scene'.

It has an importance of its own. As far as Viṣkaṁbhaka and Praveśaka are concerned they can come only in the beginning of an Act. But what should be done if something has got to be suggested in the middle of the Act? It is here especially that Cūlikā comes to help.

Now we come to Ankāsya and Aṅkāvatāra. Just as Viṣkaṁbhaka and Praveśaka appear in the beginning of an Act, in the same way the Ankāsya and the Ankāvatāra form the concluding part of an Act.

In Aṅkāsya, also known as Aṅkamukha, the characters of the previous Act suggest the situation of the new Act that immediately follows. In Aṅkāvatāra all the characters that figure in the previous act go to commence the new one. The succeeding act is in continuation with the previous one. It is, so to say, the extension of the closing Act.

A question may naturally arise as to what then is the sense of creating a new Act. The playwright ought to continue with the same. The reasons are not far to seek. There is a particular time-limit for an Act. An Act should not be too long as it would be boring to the audience. When the matter is too lengthy it is to an advantage to divide it into parts. A small interval of a few minutes does good to give the audience the necessary mental rest which will make them frseh and energetic and at the same time curious to listen to the events to follow.

Another point also may be noted. There should be some synthetic proportion among the Acts. It should not happen that one act is too long while others are too short.

Thus in Aṅkāvatāra there is a continuity of the scene with a short interruption.

---

1. Vide-Drama in Sanskrit Literature, p. 54.

ARTHAPRAKṚTI

After the discussion of five Arthopakṣepakas the ND turns to another topic, viz., the means of obtaining the fruit, technically called Arthaprakṛtis. They are in all five. The ND does not call them Arthaprakṛtis but simply recognises them as the causes or means for realising the end (Phalasya hetavaḥ)[1].

For understanding the concept of Arthaprakṛtis it should be necessary for us to bear in mind the technique of Sanskrit drama. Sanskrit drama culminates in the attainment of the desired object or fruit coveted by the hero. The whole of the play centres round this prime motive and hence constitutes a struggle on the part of the hero to obtain the desired end. But how can a single person with his human limitations achieve the end unless he is backed by other persons or favourable circumstances? In this case, he requires external help and the function of the Arthaprakṛtis is to help the hero in obtaining his end. Nevertheless, if the hero is capable of achieving the end by himself and needs no external aid some of the Arthaprakṛtis may not be introduced. The ND, therefore, has clearly stated that all of them are not indispensable and may be employed at the sweet will of the poet.[2]

These are five : Bīja, Patākā, Prakarī, Bindu and Kārya. The ND adds in the commentary that the order is not important.

These Arthaprakṛtis are primarily divided into two : (1) animate and (2) inanimate. Either of these can be subdivided into principal and subordinate. To take inanimate first Bīja is principal being the root of all further development and Kārya is subordinate. Animate is also of two types. Here Bindu is principal as it connects the different Acts with the main one. Subordinate is of two types - (i) accompanied by one's personal interest and (ii) meant for the good of the hero only with no interest of one's own. The former is Patākā while the latter is Prakarī.[3]

1. ND I, 28.
2. ND p. 41.
3. The same may be put in a tabular form as under :-

Out of these Bīja and Bindu are principal as they pervade the entire plot.

Here it should be noted that the ND has literally followed Abhinava in the above-mentioned classification.[1]

Bīja (Seed or germ) :

The Bīja is that means which in the beginning slightly indicated culminates into fruition.[2] It is like the cornseed which, though hidden in the ground when just sown, gradually develops into branches and sub-branches and ultimately yields the fruit.

The Bīja forms the beginning of the play proper. It is employed after the prologue. Bīja is the means to the realization of the fruit intended in the plot. The Prologue is the performance by the actors in order to introduce the play only and whatever speeches relating to the chief end of the play are introduced therein are meant for initiating the actual play and so even speeches uttered in the Prologue which form a part of the Bīja are repeated in the play by the character entering the stage. Just as in the RTN, the speech in the Prologue– " Destiny when favourable immediately unites one with the coveted object having brought it even from the different isle, or the middle of the ocean or from the extreme limits of a quarter "–is repeated by Yaugandharāyaṇa in the main scene.[3]

The Bīja assumes different forms. Sometimes it may constitute activity.[4] When the removal of a particular calamity is the ultimate end, it may indicate the befalling of that calamity.[5] At times it consists of an indication of the ensuing adversity or prosperity,[6] or the Bīja may mark the disappearance of the danger when calamity has already befallen.[7] Thus it may assume various forms.[8]

1. Cf. Abhi. Vol. III, p. 12. This topic has been elaborately treated by the present writer in his paper " Abhinavagupta's Division of Arthaprakṛtis : An Interpretation " (Annals of B. O. R. I., Vol. XLV).
2. ND I, 29, cf. NS XIX, 22.
3. RTN I, 6.
4. e.g. in the RTN, the activity of Yaugandharāyaṇa viz., the depositing of Sāgarikā in the harem, which is ultimately the cause of acquisition of Ratnāvalī by Udayana.
5. The ND illustrates this by a verse uttered by Śāpa in the Māyāpuṣpaka, which refers to leaving of Rāma for the forest, death of Daśaratha, etc. (ND, p. 43).
6. e.g., the speech of Māṇavaka in the TPV : " The minister even while acting unfavourably towards the master is thus severely put to trouble.........etc."
7. e.g. in the MDR, Cāṇakya says, " Who, when I am alive, wants to assault Candragupta ? " etc.
8. The ND seems to have followed Abhi. while discussing these divisions of Bīja (Cf. Abhi. III, p. 13, lines 7–9). The ND has put it more systematically and elaborately adding illustrations of its own.

The definition of the Bīja as given by the ND seems to echo the NS [1]

The introduction of the Bīja in the beginning of the play is highly necessary. It is the seed which is responsible for the further development of the plot. A seed in nature too is the origin of all creation. The apparent analogy seems here to be that of a tree. It is the seed which is responsible for the whole tree and which ultimately culminates into the fruit. In drama also Bīja is at the root of all action, and it finally transforms itself into fruit (Phala).

Patākā (Episode) :

It is so called as it increases the glory and reputation of the hero, just as the banner of a chariot or a temple increases its splendour.

It is meant for helping the cause of the hero. At the same time it has its own purpose to serve; just as Sugrīva, Vibhīṣaṇa and others, being helped by Rāma, procured for Rāma fame and name and helped him in getting Sītā back by defeating Rāvaṇa and at the same time attained their object too (as both attained their kingdoms).

Patākā is not indispensable. If the hero requires the aid of other persons in attaining his object, Patākā is to be employed. If, on the contrary, the hero rests on his own strength and does not require any external aid, Patākā is not essential. The same is the case with Prakarī also.

Patākā can come in Mukha, Pratimukha, Garbha and even Avamarśa. Patākā, as we have seen earlier, has its own aim which should be accomplished within Avamarśa because if it is stretched still further upto Nirvahaṇa it would cease to be the helper of the hero as both would have their aims achieved simultaneously. Moreover, the attention of the audience would also be divided.

Patākā and Prakarī are the two types of sub-plot (Prāsaṅgika Vṛtta)[2] and the purpose of the sub-plot is to expedite the progress of the main plot. The dramatist should also take care to see that the sub-plot is not over-delineated so as to supersede the interest of the main plot or hinder its natural progress. It is meant for helping the main action.

The term Patākā is significant. Patākā i.e. the banner of a chariot beautifies the chariot and is in itself beautiful, in the same way the hero of the Patākā helps the hero of the main plot as well as himself.

1. Cf. NS (GOS) XIX, 22.

2. Vide DR I, 13.

PATĀKĀSTHĀNAKA (Pro-episode)[1]

The authors of the ND justify the introduction of this topic when they have already started discussing Patākā. Of course, the Patākā and the Patākāsthānaka are totally distinct but there is some element of similarity between the two. Patākāsthānaka is defined as an equivocal speech or situation which foreshadows a coming event whether near at hand or distant. The element of being helpful to the main plot is common to Patākā and Patākāsthanaka.[2] Still however it is, different from Patākā and works as an embellishment of the play. It can be employed more than once and there should be no drama without it. It is employed at intervals only and not continuously as a Patākā. This is how it differs from the latter.

Types of Patākāsthānaka :

It is divided into four types :

(i) When there is an unexpected sudden gain of the desired object,[3] e g., in the RTN, act III, the King mistaking Sāgarikā, who was attempting to hang herself from a tree with a view to committing suicide, to be Vāsavadattā releases her and recognizing her by her voice cries out– 'Oh, is it my beloved Sāgarikā? Enough, enough of........etc."

Here the aim was different while another motive which is highly artistic and attractive is accomplished.[4]

(ii) The second variety consists of speech which though seemingly hyperbolic is in fact true.[5] The speech appears as a sort of exaggeration. But that apparent exaggeration is no exaggeration at all but a hard fact, e.g., in the Rāmābhyudaya, Act II, Sugrīva sends a message to Sītā :

"What more should I say? O lustrous revered lady! Rāma will bring you without loss of time even if you are on the other side of the ocean."

Here this hyperbolic statement of being on the other side of the

1. Haas – Episode-indication.

2. And that is why it is called Patākāsthānaka. Cf Patākāsthānasya tulyaṁ patākāsthānakaṁ – ND., p. 44.

3. Cf. NS (GOS) XIX. 31.

4. In this illustration the ND seems to have followed the Abhi. III, p. 19. Rāmacandra gives another illustration from the NLV, his own work, where another purpose - obtaining the picture of Damayantī – is accomplished while the king tries to prevent Vidūṣaka and Kāpālika who are prepared for a combat. For still a third illustration from the Nāg. see ND, p. 45; compare it with Abhi. III, p. 20.

5. Cf. NS, XIX. 32.

sea is actually true in the case of Sītā.[1] This also suggests that over and above the actual purpose, the other one, viz., bringing of Sītā will also be fulfilled.

(iii) The third variety consists of speech having double meaning.[2] Here by virtue of paronomasia another sense different from the one actually meant is suggested, e. g., in the RTN, " .... is waiting for Udayana, cause of great joy to the eyes,as one would do for the rising moon"[3]. Here the verse uttered to describe the evening-twilight brings out another purpose for Sāgarikā, viz., recognition of King Udayana.

(iv) When the speech uttered in reply to a person, conveys without the knowledge of the speaker another sense connected with the play and which definitely suggests as to how the things will ultimately turn out to be;[4] e. g., in the MDR, Cāṇakya - "Oh, if the wretched Rākṣasa be caught!"

Siddhārthaka (having entered)-"Sir,.. ......caught."

Here the sense which was doubtful in the first sentence when taken together with the subsequent sentence is established beyond doubt and then Cāṇakya (joyfully to himself) - "Bravo, the wretched Rākṣasa is caught!"[5] Here the peculiar co-incidence goes to suggest the future event.[6]

It will be easily seen that the ND has modelled this discussion of Patākāsthānaka purely on the NS and the Abhi. The four varieties of Patākāsthānaka and their definitions are in accordance with the NS with the only difference that the third variety of the NS has been put last

1. Vide ND p. 45; and Cf. Abhi. III, p. 20 Note the essential difference - an apparent contradiction - when Abhi refers to the Act III of the play while ND mentions Act II.
2. Cf. NS (GOS) XIX, 34.
3. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 21.
4. Cf. NS (GOS) XIX, 33.
5. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 21
6. It has to be noted here that this variety of Patākāsthānaka has an intimate similarity with the Gaṇḍa, one of the thirteen Vīthyaṅgas Gaṇḍa is explained as a speech, having a different purpose, when connected with the relevant topic, brings out a new sense which reflects upon the thing going to take place (Cf. ND II, 97 ab). ND does not refer to this point even though it has suggested the difference by pointing out that the sense contained in Gaṇḍa is bad or foul, like the foul blood in a boil. Thus the suggestion of Sītā's abondonment in Act I of the UTR though similar to the above instance (i.e. Patākāsthānaka, fourth variety), is an instance of Gaṇḍa (Cf. ND p. 138). Abhi. has done well to explain this difference correctly (Abhi. III, p. 21).

(i. e. 4th) by the ND and the fourth variety has been put as the third one. The illustrations are all mostly borrowed from the Abhi. except the one that Rāmacandra quotes from his NLV (1st variety). The DR disposes of the discussion of Patākāsthānaka by giving a general definition of Patākāsthānaka in a verse and does not bother about entering into its divisions. The DR defines it thus: "When a relevent thing going to happen is suggested by irrelevent means (Anyokti) it is known as Patākāsthānaka".[1]

Patākāsthānaka which may be translated into English as 'Dramatic Irony' has a special importance in Drama. It adds charm to the situation. It occurs when there in one meaning for the actors on the stage and another meaning quite different from it for the audience in the theatre. The use of such irony in a drama is like sauce and salt which makes the dish palatable. Life, as we know, is full of irony and since drama is the imitation of life, it is also capable of ironic treatment.

Patākāsthānaka, like irony, is mostly based on double significance. But it has to be noted with reference to the Patākāsthānaka that its chief purpose is to be helpful in the development of plot. It is not meant simply as a decoration.

Prakarī (Incident):

Just as the Patākā is meant for helping the hero in his efforts, so is also the Prakarī. But Prakarī goes one step forward in the sense that its sole aim is to help the hero while Patākā has its own purpose also to achieve. That is why it is called Prakarī which means "that which helps ($\sqrt{\overline{K\d{r}}}$ - to do or to render (help)) specially (Pra)"[2].

Moreover like Patākā, Prakarī is also not inevitable. It differs from the Patākā on the point that it is highly short-lived, while Patākā extends over longer duration. The episode of Jaṭāyu in the story of Rāma is an illustration of this type.[3]

The DR does not seem to take into account the fact that in Prakarī the Prakarī-nāyaka has no personal motive to accomplish (and thus renders selfless help to the hero), and consequently illustrates it by the Śravaṇa-episode in the Rāmāyaṇa[4]. According to the DR Patākā stretches far while Prakarī is short-lived. Someśvara opines that Prakarī constitutes description of the season and the like, that occurs in a composition. It

1. Vide DR I, 14.
2. Vide ND, p. 46.
3. The ND has followed here Abhinava.
4. Cf. yad alpaṁ sā prakarī, śravaṇādivṛttāntavat.—DR : Avaloka, p. 4.

is meant to help others just as a small bunch of flowers (laghuḥ puṣpādiprakaraḥ prakarī) is meant to decotate the bed (or the table) etc.[1]

Bindu (Expansion) :

The main purpose is often lost sight of on account of other digressions which come in the middle and are necessary too. But again that main thread should be taken up. This important work of joining the broken link once again is performed by Bindu. It pervades the whole story as an oil-drop spreads over the entire surface of water, and that is why it is called Bindu - a drop- as it has the pervading capacity.[2] Thus Bindu like Bīja pervades the whole of the story with the difference that Bīja starts from Mukha Sandhi itself, while Bindu follows it.

Bindu plays an important part in the achievement of fruit. The fruit may belong to the hero, or his helpmate (i. e. Patākānāyaka) or both. Thus Bindu serves the purpose of linking the activities of all these. The hero, for instance, links the activities of his antagonist and vice versa, e. g., in the RBh (Act V), while hearing the story of Sugrīva, Rāma becomes unhappy being reminded of the abduction of Sītā. The ND also illustrates from the TPV (Act II)[3].

Kārya :- (Denouement) - It brings the seed sown by the hero or the Patākānāyaka or the Prakarīnāyaka to perfection by developing it into fruit in the form of achievement of the desired object. Bhoja remarks that it consists of any one of the three principal objects of human life, viz., Dharma, Artha and Kāma [4]

The ND explains as to how the importance (Mukhyatā) or otherwise of any Arthaprakṛti is decided. The ND has stated at the outset that out of the five, Bīja and Bindu are principal and the rest are subordinate.[5] This is because that the former pair (Bīja and Bindu) pervades the entire story while the remaining may be principal or subordinate according to their utility in the achievement of fruit.[6] Thus in the MRC,

---

1. KP · Kāvyādarśasamketa, p 220.
2. Cf. ND p, 46. Someśvara gives anothor explanation of the word. Just as the drops of ghee dropping gradually (one after another) cause the fire to burn continuously, in the same way Bindu (viz., Viṣkambhaka, Praveśaka etc) becomes the cause of combining the scattered threads (literally limbs) of the story or plot.
   - KP, Kāvyādarśasamketa p, 220.
3. Vide ND, p 47.
4. धर्मार्थकामानामन्यतमं हि पुरुषार्थं कार्यमिति आमनन्ति । SP (MS) p. 171.
5. ND, p, 41
6. It is true that Kārya is as indispensable as Bija and Bindu, still it is the natural consequence and hence relatively less Important as compared to the cause which is Bija.

the Patākā viz., the story of Āryaka, becomes principal and important. Even Prakarī in the Kundamālā, viz., rearing of Sītā and her two children by Vālmīki becomes principal. Both Patākā and Prakarī get importance in Rāma-story, for example, the story of Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa (Prakarī). Where Patākā and Prakarī are not important or are completely absent, Kārya becomes principal.

When Patākā enjoys a prominent position it too has the Sandhis. They are known as Anusandhis. They are meant to help the main Sandhis. If not so, the story of Patākā would not be known as sub-plot and there would be increase in the number of Sandhis[1]. The Anusandhis can be two (Mukha and Nirvahaṇa) or more.

AVASTHĀ

There are certain stages through which a hero passes as he employs the different means while trying to achieve the end. They constitute the activities of the body, the speech and the mind.[2] These are five in number : (1) Āraṁbha, (2) Yatna, (3) Prāptyāśā, (4) Niyatāpti and (5) Phalāgama. They are indispensable in a drama. In a sub-plot they remain in a subordinate position. In Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇikā all the five stages are employed but in Vyāyoga and others all may or may not be employed.

They are to be introduced in the same order as stated above. Naturally a man with sound reason will first begin a task, then he will make strenuous efforts to achieve the object (Yatna), by and by he will have the hope of success (Prāptyāśā), then he will be sure of his success provided he succeeds in removing a particular impediment on the way (Niyatāpti) and finally he will achieve the object in view (Phalāgama).

Āraṁbha (Beginning). - It is the eagernees or inner urge to procure the fruit or the desired object,[3] and the efforts as a result of the eagerness.[4]

This is the first stage of the plot-development. Drama represents the struggle of a noble man - hero - to achieve a particular, desired object. Before the efforts can actually start there must be a burning desire - an inner urge to achieve that object. A strong will is the first requirement for any task to be accomplished. The will first, and the efforts will follow automatically. Thus Āraṁbha does not mean

1. ND, p. 48.
2. ND, p. 49.
3. ND, I, 35a.
4. ND, p. 50.

barren desire. The hero here starts his preliminary attempts to achieve the subject.

In these Avasthās the different activities of one or more of the following viz., the hero, the helpmate, the rival or enemy, and fate are seen. Even if beginning may be caused by fate still it does not imply total negation of human efforts. Fate and efforts, both combined, bring out good or evil results. Both are supplementary to each other.

Prayatna (Effort).-It means acceleration of efforts and activity to achieve the end. Here eagerness has increased considerably and a serious effort has been started. Āraṁbha implies simple eagerness. In Yatna the same eagerness is heightened, e. g., in the RTN, the heroine tries to paint the picture of Udayana when she thought that it was not possible to see him personally. This shows that her love has considerably advanced.[1]

This is a subsequent stage in the normal course. When a person thinks over a particular object he develops attachment for it and gradually becomes passionate about it. This passion does not allow him to be at rest. He tries to achieve it by hook or crook. He pursues the object and thus the efforts start.

Prāptyāśā (Hope or prospect of success). - Here there is a hope for the achievement of the fruit on account of certain occurrence or event only. Here there is no other fruit obtainable nor does it imply the removal of all obstacles. There is a hope that the fruit will be achieved. Just as in the Veṇī. (Act III) with the killing of Duḥśāsana at the hands of Bhīma, we naturally expect that all the rest of the Kauravas will also be killed.

After efforts comes the hope. One should deserve first and then desire. What is impossible for a man who has a strong will and puts in untiring hard work? By continuous struggle man does go near to his target. The target seems to be at hand, and there is a ray of hope that inspires him to struggle with doubled zest and vigour. Still the obstacles are equally great.

Niyatāpti (Certainty of success) : All the obstacles in the path of the achievement of fruit have been removed, and all the helping causes have conjoined together and consequently the fruit - achievement is sure (Niyata) only if a particular obstacle is overcome, e. g., in the Veṇī. the entry of Bhīma and Arjuna in search of Duryodhana with the words of Bhīma, "Where is Duryodhana, the author of deceits in

1. Cf. RTN, p. 31 lines 11-12.

gambling, the igniter of the house made of lac...... ? " etc. suggests the certainty of success provided Duryodhana is captured and killed.

In Prāptyāśā we have seen that by continuous efforts, the person entertains a hope that he will be able to attain his end. This is like a beacon-light which impels the man to move on and on in the direction of light. So this stage is highly essential. But the course of life -the course of high ambitions and achievements -never runs smooth. One has to meet a thousand and one impediments. By patience and perseverence one has to cross this thorny road to success. Life is a continuous struggle and drama is nothing but an imitation of life. The purpose of drama is to mirrorise life. Thus struggle or conflict becomes the essence of drama.

Here is an essential difference between the Sanskrit drama and the western drama. In western drama the hero, though trying his best, is sometimes represented as being unable to cross the difficulties beset as he is with human infirmities. Man is after all man. He is never perfect and often gives way to his personal defects which he cannot overcome, and there starts the tragedy. This is more realistic as in life good men do not always prosper. On the contrary, the good and virtuous have to suffer while the cunning and wicked take undue advantage of their goodness. Like the drama of life, English drama too often ends in catastrophe. But Sanskrit theory allows no such tragedy on stage. The Indians are highly optimistic about life. They firmly believe that good will end in good. So the obstacles do come, and the good have to pass through all the thick and thin of life, but ultimately achieve the end. Thus at this stage the impediments being cleared out the hero is sure of achieving his goal.

Phalāgama (Achievement of the fruit). Phalāgama means the immediate achievement of the desired fruit. This achievement must be immediate and not such as may be obtainable in the other birth like other fruits such as heaven etc., that are obtained by the performance of meritorious deeds such as giving alms, etc. Phalāgama means the approach of the fruit. It denotes the beginning of the arrival and not the actual arrival. The obtainment of fruit by the hero is the chief purpose of the play. Thus these are the five stages in the course of the obtainment of fruit. Other stages may be produced by the activities or efforts of the ministers, the heroine, enemies, fate etc., but in such a way that ultimately the fruit of the play goes to the hero only.

This is the final stage of the play. The seed sown in the first stage has developed into a fruit. The efforts of the hero together with other assistants, have borne here the actual fruit.

SANDHIS

After having discussed the different stages (Avasthās) of the plot-development, our authors turn to another aspect of the plot, viz., Sandhis (junctures). The Sandhis are (five, (1) Mukha, (2) Pratimukha, (3) Garbha, (4) Avamarśa (or Āmarśa or Vimarśa) and (5) Nirvahaṇa.

The word Sandhi is derived from the root 'Dhā' with 'Sam' which means 'to join together'. Sandhi therefore literally means a joint. Sandhis are responsible for joining or connecting harmoniously the different parts of the story (or plot) which are linked together by their contribution towards the same end, each part having its own secondary end, just as the joints of the body join the different limbs of the body.

They correspond to the five Avasthās, such as Ārambha, Yatna, etc., i.e. Mukha corresponds to Ārambha, Pratimukha to Yatna, Garbha to Prāptyāśā and so on.

As the Avasthās such as Ārambha, Yatna etc. are indispensable in the same way the five corresponding Sandhis too cannot be dispensed with in Nāṭaka, Prakarana, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇikā. In Samavakāra and others all the five are not needed.

The Sandhis of the sub-plot are known as Anusandhis (smaller Sandhis).

It appears that the idea of Sandhis is based on the analogy of human body[1]. Poetry is often compared to the human form of a male or a charming damsel[2]. Word and sense are its body[3]. Rasa is its soul. Figures of speech are its embellishments. Guṇas are its qualities like beauty, valour etc., and so on. The same analogy is continued in the concept of Sandhis also. Joints in the body perform the work of connecting the limbs. Similarly, Sandhis, in the drama, connect the different stages of the plot. A thing appears charming only when its parts are properly joined with one another.

The important point that is suggested here is this that five Sandhis correspond to the five stages (Avasthās) stated before. This will mean that the Sandhis strictly correspond to the Avasthās. Each of them begins with the corresponding Avasthā and ends with it.

1. *Mukha* (opening). - It is that part of the main plot where the Bīja originates. It corresponds with the first stage called Ārambha. Just as the face is the most prominent part of the body so is Mukha to the

1. Cf. The idea of Sarasvati-putra or Kavyapuruṣa as given by Rājaśekhara-vide KM, chapter III.

2. Kavitā-Kāminī, Cf. PR. I, 22.

3. Śabdārthau śarīram-KM, p. 6.

main plot[1]. It marks the beginning of the play. Here the seed (Bīja) is first sown and the sentiment first depicted[2], e.g. in the first act of the RTN where we find a fusion of different sentiments such as Vīra (in the desire of Yaugandharāyaṇa to conquer the whole of the world); Śṛṅgāra enkindled by spring in Udayana, Adbhuta in the witnessing of the people's festivities and again Śṛṅgāra commencing from the arrival in the garden[3]. In the Satyahariścandra too we find different sentiments like Adbhuta, Karuṇa, Raudra, Vīra, etc., depicted in Mukha.

Here again the ND emphasizes the importance of Rasa in a play. Rasa is the soul of dramatic performance and so the dramatist should not lose sight of it.

2. *Pratimukha* (progression) is that part of the plot where the seed which is seen in Mukha and then veiled by some secondary incident becomes manifest. It is accompanied by the stage 'Yatna'. It is so called because it is favourable (Prati = Ābhimukhya) to Mukha, e g, in the RTN the seed which is sown by the utterance of Yaugandharāyaṇa : "Destiny when favourable....", etc,[4] is veiled and becomes hardly visible in the spring-festival and cupid-worship; and is clearly unfolded in Act II at the meeting of the King and Sāgarikā, arranged by Susaṅgatā and hence Pratimukha[5].

3. *Garbha* (Climax). - It is that part of the plot which is accompanied by the stage Prāptyāśā. The seed which has been originated and manifest further develops to a stage wherein it is gained and lost in turns by the hero and he frequently searches every time it is lost.[6]

The ND illustrates from the Veni. Acts III, IV and V. At the end it points out that in Garbha the element of loss or despair predominates since here there is merely a probability of attainment of fruit; otherwise the acquisition of fruit would be sure and certain. Contrary is the case in Avamarśa where the element of gain or hope dominates, which indicates the certainty of success in acquiring the object[7].

---

1. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 23. ND has verbally followed Abhi.
2. ND seems to emphasize the depiction of sentiment which is the chief aim of drama according to Sanskrit rhetoricians.
3. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 23. The illustration is the same as in the Abhi. The ND has expanded and elucidated what Abhi. has stated very briefly.
4. RTN I, 6.
5. The ND has followed Abhi. here. The DR and others define this as that part of the plot wherein the Bīja develops in such a way as to be perceptible and imperceptible in turns. DR I, 30.
6. Garbha is so called because fruit lies concealed in it.
7. The ND clearly echoes Abhi, III, p. 26 lines 6-8.

Here one point deserves attention. The ND has started illustrating from the RTN and we naturally expect illustrations from the same, in order to have a coherent, unified impression. But here we find the ND illustrating from a different work viz., the Veṇī., inspite of the fact that Abhinava from whom the ND has drawn abundantly illustrates from the RTN. (The ND probably switches over to the Veni. from the RTN with the conviction that the Veṇī. (Acts III to V) provides a more convincing illustration of the Garbha than the RTN. Again here each Sandhi is to be illustrated suitably. It is, therefore, not binding on the authors to illustrate all the Sandhis from one play only).

4. *Avamarśa* or *Vimarśa* (Pause) is that part of the plot where the seed which is sown in Mukha and is fast developing into fruit meets with some serious obstacle. It corresponds with the fourth stage called Niyatāpti. Vimarśa is so called because the hero here thinks (Vi+Mṛś = to think), that is, reflects or doubts the attainment of fruit though it is near at hand, on account of some powerful obstruction. Thus there is a cause for despair. Nevertheless the great men when obstructed by impediments strive more assiduously and hence are sure to attain the object. These impediments must be shown to befall the hero in order to illustrate that the path to success never runs smooth. It is beset with thorns. Yet one should not slacken one's efforts for the attainment of the fruit as the fortune favours the brave. These obstacles may be of a hundred types being caused by curse, anger, selfishness, etc. The ND gives a number of illustrations from different works such as the RBh, the RV, the Śāk, the Vidhivilasita and the Veṇī[1]. The Abhi. points out that this Sandhi is 'Sandehātmaka'. According to him Sandeha is possible even after Sambhāvanā, when some unforeseen obstacle appears in the way of achievement of the desired object.

5. *Nirvahaṇa* (Close or Denouement) - It is that part of the plot where the seed and its different stages of development together with all Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis and Sandhis are shown to contribute to the production of fruit. It corresponds to the stage called Phalāgama. It ends with the actual attainment of fruit which marks the end of the play itself, e.g., in the RTN after the entry of the magician upto the end[2].

Some opine that Nirvahaṇa is that part of the plot where different Sandhis beginning with Mukha and different Avasthās are again briefly

1. ND, pp. 57-58.

2. Here the ND has closely followed Abhi. III, p. 29 lines 17-18.

touched or indicated one by one,[1] e.g., in the Satya. Act VI the speech of God namely, "We, desirous of testing your worth or excellence, created all this, viz., hunting, the ascetic-girl, the Kulapati, the parrot, the jackals, the travellers, the King of the Mlecchas, the death of a man...." etc.

Here hunting etc., indicates Mukha, the parrot, etc., Pratimukha; the traveller, etc., Garbha; and the man, etc., Vimarśa. Thus all these Sandhis together with the corresponding Avasthās are mentioned here.

In fact, this Sandhi occupies a relatively shorter duration. Avamarśa ends with the removal of the final impediment which obstructed the path of success and accomplishment of fruit and here the Nirvahaṇa begins. Naturally, the drama at this stage is drawing to its close.

It is quite evident that the authors of the ND are considerably indebted to the Abhi. for the entire discussion on this subject. Nevertheless the ND deserves special credit for good many illustrations which it has supplied, at times from Rāmacandra's own works and which go a long way in making the concepts concrete.

Jagirdar opines that the five stages of development mentioned above (i.e. the five Sandhis) are just the five members of a syllogism in Indian Logic[2]. But this sort of comparison is not quite correct or covincing[3].

Critical Remarks :

A deeper study of the trinity of Sandhis, Avasthās and Arthaprakṛtis will make it abundantly clear that there is a string of unity of concept running through all these three. It will not be far to realise that Avasthās, as the name itself suggests, indicate the stages (or conditions) of development. These stages of development are from the point of view of the hero. These Avāsthās indicate the psychological development of the hero. First of all a desire springs in the heart of the hero. This marks the beginning of play proper and the first stage called Ārambha. The desire, when it is a genuine one, is always succeeded by ardent efforts in order to accomplish it. This forms the second stage known as Yatna. But the course of victory or success never runs smooth. It is generally infested with innumerable impediments and for a moment the hope for success is lost. This is a state of suspense and known as Prāptyāśā.

1. It is difficult to decide whose view this is. It has been referred to briefly by Abhi. in one sentence. Vide Abhi. III, p. 29 lines 6-7. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra have lucidly put this view adding an illustration from Rāmacandra's own work.
2. Drama in Sankrit Literature, p. 119
3. Cf. The conception of Sandhis in Sanskrit Dramas (J.O.I., Baroda, Vol. V, No. 4) p. 378.

(This is known as 'Climax' in English Drama). But soon the mist of suspense is to be cleared, the darkness dispelled, the obstacles overcome and the attainment of the end is almost certain but for the removal of one or two obstacles. This is Niyatāpti and finally the obstacles that blocked the path are removed completely and the final object attained (Phalāgama). Thus it is evident that here we get an analysis of the plot or action purely from the view point of the hero who by all means is the central figure of the play.

Sandhis form an objective analysis of the plot from the point of view of the playwright himself. A playwright is supposed to develop the play in a fixed pattern. He cannot show the achievement of the fruit first and the efforts afterwards. This would sound awkward and absurd. The plot should develop in a very natural, realistic, psychological, dramatic way. There should be a definite aim to be achieved and all the incidents, episodes and the like represented should be ultimately conducive to the achievement of that aim First, he should represent the seed, the germ-the motive force of the plot-development. The germ is responsible for rousing the hero to action.

These Sandhis well agree with the five stages of comedy in western drama, which are (1) cause or beginning, (2) growth or progression, (3) height or climax, (4) pause or consequence and (5) close[1].

The divisions into Avasthās will obviously appear to be very logical and psychological. This concept of Avasthā very much corresponds with the five stages of plot-development according to the western critics. According to western critics conflict is the soul of drama. Drama, mirrorising life, must represent, in the true sense, the conflict-the conflict of ideas and emotions, thoughts and ideals, rights and duties. These conflicts are universal. Life deprived of conflicts can never be imagined. At every step, man is confronted with innumerable difficulties. What to do and what not to do is the problem which every sane person has to face. So the climax in drama comes in the middle in the stage Prāptyāśā where the fate of the hero appears to hang in a balance. He is suffering through acute mental torture and trying to cross the vast ocean of difficulties, making his way through all the thick and thin. The curiosity as to what will happen now is at the highest here. But slowly and gradually in the course of the last two stages the hero overcomes the difficulties one by one, and the spectators' minds are proportionately relieved of the tension, and ultimately the play closes with the attainment of the object in view. The five stages (Avasthās) should invariably be present in the Nāṭaka.

1. In tragedies the last two stages are (iv) fall and (v) catastrophe.

Arthaprakṛtis, on the other hand, are not, strictly speaking, the divisions of the plot. They are in fact as Bhoja and other theorists[1] have pointed out, the material causes (Hetu, Kāraṇa) of the plot. In other words, they are the factors that are responsible for the smooth and gradual development of the plot. The ND is therefore perfectly justified when it calls them "means of achieving the fruit" (Phalasya hetavaḥ).

The development of the plot is comparable to the development of a seed into fruit The name Bīja (seed or germ), which marks the beginning of the play, appears to be significant. It is the motive force of all dramatic action. The same Bīja which is sown in Mukha shoots forth, develops and ultimately transforms itself into fruit. But before that it has to pass through the three Sandhis for its full growth.

Sandhi is so called because :

(1) It properly joins the different parts of the plot into a harmonious one.

(2) It is the result of the combination between Avasthās and Arthaprakṛtis (The view of the DR).

The DR, while discussing the Sandhis, lays down that the five Arthaprakṛtis joined respectively to the five Avasthās give rise to the five Sandhis beginning with Mukha.

Thus Bīja when joined with Ārambha will give rise to Mukha, Bindu with Yatna to Pratimukha and so on.

This view of the DR is not convincing for various reasons :

(i) Patākā and Prakarī are not indispensable in the plot as they are to be employed only if the hero requires the external aid for achieving his end[2] and even in their absence all the five Sandhis are seen.

(ii) Patākā needs not occur in Garbha only. It may start with Mukha or Pratimukha and stretch upto Avamarśa even.

Similarly it is not proper to confine Prakarī to Avamarśa only.

(iii) The Bīja is not confined merely to Mukha. It, in fact, pervades the entire plot as it is the Bīja whose progressive development into the fruit is the ultimate aim of the drama.

Bindu also is to be employed not only once but may be employed as many times as the main thread is lost sight of and in any of the five Sandhis. It pervades the entire plot.[3]

1. Cf. Bhoja who explains them as–Kathāśarīropādānakāraṇabhūtāḥ–SP(MS). p. 169.
2. Vide ND, P. 41; also Abhi. III, p. 16.
3. Cf. Bhoja, who explains it as–Yāvatsamāpti yadbandhaḥ–SP (MS), p. 170.

Thus this mathematical formula laid down by the DR cannot be accepted literally.

If at all we want to justify the DR the statement may be understood as representing a state of idealistic perfection of dramatic technique.

Prof. K. P. Kulkarni also does not seem to be correct when he explains the Arthaprakṛtis as stages in the development of the action and the five Sandhis as corresponding to the five Arthaprakṛtis.[1]

SANDHYAṄGAS

The ND begins with the subdivisions of Mukha Sandhi. They are twelve in all begining with Upakṣepa and ending in Paribhāvanā[2]. Out of these twelve, the first six, viz. Upakṣepa, Parikara, Parinyāsa, Samāhiti, Udbheda, and Karaṇa occour in the Mukha Sandhi only. Out of these six again, the first three are to be put in the same order and that too in the beginning, the fourth one in the middle and the fifth and the sixth at almost the end of Mukha. The first five of the above limbs together with Yukti are indispensable here. The remaining ones viz., Vilobhana, etc., are possible in other Sandhis also irrespective of the specified order if the plot demands it. Bheda which implies exit of characters[3] has got to be employed at the end of every Act and at the end of Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka as well. Sandhaṅgas are employed after the prologue as prologue does not form a part of the drama proper. In this introductory paragraph about Sandhyaṅgas the ND touches some of the note-worthy points about the concept of Sandhyaṅgas. It points out that a particular Sandhyaṅga may be the Aṅga or part of a particular Sandhi only, but it does not mean that it is to be employed only there. In fact, most of the Sandhyaṅgas excepting a few can be employed in any of the five Sandhis. The fact that it is a part of a particular Sandhi simply means that it is usually and more often found in that Sandhi. This does not deprive it of the right to appear in other Sandhis also. Moreover, it is possible to reduce the number of the Sandhyaṅgas as some of them can be included in others. But the ND adheres to the old tradition.

Now the ND states the purpose of Sandhyaṅgas. The ND points out that they must be employed because they develop the plot[4]; otherwise the story though possessed of all Sandhis will be too brief; e. g, the

1. Vide-Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists, pp. 37-38.
2. Cf. ND. I, 41, 42.
3. Vide ND, I, 44d.
4. Cf. ND, p. 59-60.

entire story of Rāma could be covered in a few sentences, viz., the wife of Rāma was abducted by Rāvaṇa in the forest, Rāma made Sugrīva his friend by procuring for him the monkey-kingdom, constructed a bridge over the sea, killed Rāvaṇa and brought Sītā back.

Moreover, what sort of interest will such a story create in the minds of the readers ? On the other hand, even an uninteresting story when represented strikingly through Sandhyaṅgas becomes highly enjoyable. Even if the story is repeated when the occasion demands it, it does not appear to be so when expressed with the help of Sandhyaṅgas. Thus the plot is saved from being tedious.

Much of this discussion is based on the Abhi[1]. As regards the purpose of Sandhyaṅgas the ND has in mind the NS and the DR. The NS (DR simply follows it) gives sixfold purpose of Sandhyaṅgas[2], and the same has been summarized with apt illustrations by the ND.

Bharata stretches the popular analogy of Kāvya and the human body, and points out that Sandhyaṅgas are to drama what limbs are to body[3].

Now we take up individual Sandhyaṅgas one by one.

1. *Upakṣepa*—Sowing of the seed is Upakṣepa[4]. Here there is simply a suggestion of the seed or the central motive which is to expand over the the whole of the play, e.g., in the RTN I, 6, Yaugandharāyaṇa's speech, viz., "Destiny if favourable at once brings the desired object, even from a different isle, ..." etc. suggests the course of events to follow, viz., the union of Udayana and Sāgarikā who comes actually from the other isle.

2 *Parikara* consists in a slight expansion of the central motive which is already suggested by the previous limb, e. g., in the Veṇī, I, 10 Bhīma's declaration that he would break the peace as soon as it was effected strengthens the idea that war was inevitable[5].

3. *Parinyāsa* - When the seed which is thus expanded is specially confirmed beyond any shadow of doubt it is called Parinyāsa[6], e. g., in the Veṇī. (I, 21) Bhīma's assertion that he would surely break the thighs

1. Cf. Abhi. III, pp. 36–37.
2. NS XIX, 51–52.
3. Cf. NS (GOS) XIX, 53.
4. The definition is quite similar to the DR where we find "Nyāsa" instead of "Upti" of the ND. Both the ND and the DR illustrate from RTN I, 6.
5. The same illustration is found in the Abhi. III, p. 38.
6. NS and DR define it as Tanniṣpatti. ND's definition seems to follow Abhinava. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 38.

of Duryodhana and braid the hair of Draupadī clearly affirms the seed already sown[1].

The ND notes that these three limbs of Mukha Sandhi should follow in succession[2]. The reason is quite clear. The seed has to be sown first, then expanded and then confirmed.

4. *Samāhiti*[3] - Repetition of the briefly-stated seed in order to establish it clearly beyond doubt is Samāhiti[4], e.g., Veṇī. I, 24 clearly points out that the anger of Yudhiṣṭhira, is now violently stirred and is working in all its fury against Kurus.

5. *Udbheda* - is the sprouting up of the seed. The seed that is sown at the commencement of the play now springs up as a young sprout springs up from the earth. The seed sown in the ground becomes swollen first. This is the earliest stage of the growth of the seed as the seed that lay hidden is slightly brought to light. Thus it is a part of Mukha only and not of Pratimukha which implies a complete manifestation or full development of the seed, e.g., in the Veṇī. (I, 26) Bhīma's declaration of his determination to kill all the Kurus and not to see Draupadī before doing it.

The ND here gives the view of some others who define it as 'unfolding of a secret', e.g., in the RTN the verse Astāpāsta......etc., (I, 23) uttered by the bard reveals the identity of Udayana.

The view is evidently held by the DR[5]. The illustration too is from the DR.

6. *Karaṇa* - is commencing to do what is appropriate to the occasion, e.g., in the Veṇī. (Act I), Sahadeva and Bhīma declare to proceed to fight the Kurus[6].

The ND here mentions the view of some[7] who define Karaṇa as removal (destruction) of calamities by blessings or other means.

But most of the works agree with the first view which the ND accepts. The NLR calls this limb as Kāraṇa though its definition and the illustration are not different.

1. This illustration is found in Abhi. III, p. 38.
2. ND, p. 61.
3. In the NS the fourth Aṅga is Vilobhana and Samāhiti or Samādhāna stands seventh. But the ND has clarified at the outset that the order of these Aṅgas, unless it is so specified, is not binding.
4. Sam (well) + ā (on all sides) + √dhā (to put or to nourish).
5. Cf. DR I, 29b.
6. The same illustration is found in Abhi. III, p. 41 and also DR, p. 10.
7. It is not quite clear as to whose view the ND refers to here.

7. *Vilobhana* – consists in supporting a person in his desire to do a particular thing by means of praise, e.g., in the Veṇī. (p. 19) Draupadī pays a handsome tribute to Bhīma by saying, "What is difficult, my lord, for you to accomplish when (once) you are violently enraged ?"[1]

The ND has followed Abhinava here. The latter remarks that this limb and the first three (viz., Upakṣepa, Parikara and Parinyāsa) occur usually in the Mukha only. The NS has put it after Parinyāsa and so the ND remarks that it occurs after Parinyāsa only but it is not mentioned after Parinyāsa as Vilobhana can occur in other Sandhis also.

8. *Bhedana*[2] – It is the exit of the characters on the stage. When the characters (on the stage) leave the stage in pursuance of some end or the other it is known as Bhedana, e.g., in the Venī. the powerful speech of Bhīma declaring the heroism of the sons of Pāṇḍu in the battle-field results into the exit of Sahadeva (and Bhīma also) from the stage[3].

The ND mentions here the view of others who define it as "encouraging the person"[4].

The ND mentions still a third view according to which Bhedana consists of the expedient of sowing dissension among the foes who have joined together and who bar the appearance of fruit from the seed[5].

9. *Prāpaṇa*[6] – is defined as "obtainment of pleasure or what would bring happiness; e.g., in the Veṇī. Bhīma is happy to learn from the Kañcukin, that Kṛṣṇa has failed to settle the feud peacefully[7].

---

1. ND, p. 64. Abhi. too gives the same illustration. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 38. DR gives Veṇī. I, 22 as the instance of this Aṅga.
2. The NS (also the DR) calls it Bheda.
3. Here ND has followed the Abhi. The illustration is also drawn from the Abhi. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 42.
4. The view referred to here belongs to none else but the DR. The illustration given here is also in accordance with that of DR, cf. Avaloka, p. 11.
5. It is not quite clear as to whose view exactly the ND is referring to here. The ND does nothing more but mentioning it. It does not illustrate. Shri G. K. Shrigondekar considers this to be the view of the DR (vide, ND : Preface p. 6) but the view is not found in the DR. It may probably refer to Bhoja who defines it as "Saṁghātarūpabhedaḥ."

   The NS defines the limb as Saṁghātabhedanārtha i.e. disruption of the union (NS (KM)XIX, 73). The word is open to a double interpretation. The ND has followed the one given by Abhinava, viz., 'dispersal of characters under one reason or the other,' while others seem have interpreted it differently (i.e. disrupting the enemies).
6. The NS calls it Prāpti.
7. Veṇī. p. 20.

A particular Aṅga is at times repeated in one and the same Sandhi in order to provide striking or extraordinary speech in abundance. In the Veṇī. this same Anga is repeated in the words of Bhīma, viz., "Shall I not destroy through rage the hundred Kauravas in the battle ?......etc.",[1] which give great pleasure to Draupadī.

10. *Yukti* - consists in pondering over the action or the task to be accomplished with proper discrimination taking into full consideration the merits and demerits or advantages and disadvantages of the same.

The ND illustrates from the Udāttarāghava where Lakṣmaṇa ponders over the act of Kaikeyī and Bharata.[2]

11. *Vidhāna* - When happiness and misery are represented in one character or different characters we have Vidhāna. Vidhāna is of four types:-

(i) Happiness and misery are found in one character.
(ii) Happiness and misery are found in different characters.
(iii) In one character there is only happiness.
(iv) In one character there is only misery.

This Aṅga is to be distinguished from Prāpaṇa or Prāpti which also implies attainment of happiness. In fact Prāpti indicates the search for happiness or the object of happiness, while in Vidhāna the happiness is just at hand and belongs to one character only.

12. *Paribhāvanā* - is astonishment or rather curiosity to know what a particular thing is. Just as in the Nāgānanda when the heroine is seen by the hero he begins to imagine who she is[3].

Looking to the form of this Anga and the illustration of the ND we are immediately reminded of the figure of speech called Sandeha. It is probable that some of the Angas like this later on developed into figures of speech.

Now let us consider the Aṅgas of Pratimukha Sandhi. They are thirteen in all. Here the order is not so important. The first eight Aṅgas may or may not have scope in this Sandhi, depending upon the nature of the subject-matter. The remaining five ought to be necessarily employed in this Sandhi.[4]

13. *Vilāsa* - is the desire of man and woman for the pleasure of Love. The ND illustrates from the Śāk. (II, 1-2) where Duṣyanta expresses his desire for Śakuntalā.

1. Veṇī. I, 15. The illustration seems to have been cited, following the DR. Cf. DR, p. 8. Abhi. cites another illustration, of course, from the same work viz. Veṇī.
2. Vide ND, p. 66.
3. Cf. Nāg. I, 15.
4. ND I, 46-47.

This Aṅga must be employed in the beginning of Pratimukha only. Whatever sentiment has been delineated in Mukha, the same has to be developed by Vibhāva, Anubhāva, etc. in Pratimukha. Thus, love that is depicted in Mukha in amorous dramas (whose fruit is acquisition of love) is developed in Pratimukha by the aid of Vilāsa. In dramas dominated by heroic sentiment Vilāsa stands for energy (Utsāha).[1]

Here the ND criticizes the love-scene between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī in the Veṇī. which is a drama of heroic sentiment. The ND has clearly pointed out that in a heroic drama Vilāsa should not be taken to mean amorous sport as love has little scope there and so the Vilāsa depicted in the Veṇī. in the midst of war is highly improper. The ND quotes in support of the view a Kārikā from the Dhvanyāloka,[2] viz., " Sandhis and Sandhyangas are to be employed with a view to developing Rasa and not merely to fulfil the conditions of the Śāstra.[3]

The love-scene in the Veṇī. has been a subject of criticism by most of the rhetoricians. Abhinava[4] criticizes it in the particular context, so does Hemacandra. The ND simply reproduces this criticism.

14. *Dhūnana*[5] - is a slight disrespect shown to the request made. The ND illustrates from the Pārthavijaya where Yudhiṣṭhira persuades Bhīma to help Duryodhana who was captured by Citrasena but Bhīma refuses to help him who was the doer of so many misdeeds.

The ND refers to the view of some who define Dhūnana as despondency (Arati)[6], The ND includes it under Rodha.

15. *Rodha* is (frustration) or despondency on account of the hindrances in the way of obtaining the desired object. The ND illustrates from the Devī. where the speech of Rāmagupta addressed to Candragupta (disguised as a woman) giving vent to his love for him is taken by Dhruvadevī as one addressed to a lady and she is highly distressed.

16. *Sāntvana* - is pacification of an angry person. The illustration is given from RBh. where Rāvaṇa, who is infuriated by the unpleasant

1. Here the ND has followed Abhinava. Cf Abhi - Iha ca ratigrahaṇam pumarthopayogi rasagatasthāyibhāvopalakṣaṇaṁ, tena vīrapradhāneṣu rūpakeṣu ... ratirūpeṇa utsāhaḥ - (Vol. III, p. 42).

2. The criticism of the love-scene in the Veṇī. is also found in Dhv. p. 263,

3. Cf. Dhv. III, 12.

4. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 42.

5. The NS and the DR call it Vidhūta.

6. The view referred to is held by the DR. Cf. DR I, 33a.

words of Mārīca and therefore girds up his loins to send him to heaven, is pacified by Prahasta. In the speech of Mārīca there is another limb called Vajra which consists in a cruel remark. Vajra is explained later on.[1] This clearly indicates that the order followed does not have any significance. One more hint that we get here is that it often happens that one limb may go to develop the other. Limbs are often mutually connected. Thus Sāntvana and Vajra have a special relation.

Sāntvana implies pacification of anger. This anger is naturally caused by some unpleasant or haughty talk. In this case Vajra becomes the cause of Sāntvana. It can also be established that Vajra should generally be succeeded by Sāntvana as Bharata prohibits the scenes of actual violence on the stage. The playwright may suggest the battle by sending them away from the stage in the heat of anger.

The NS (and the DR) calls this limb Paryupāsanā, which is defined as pacification of the furious[2].

17. *Varṇasaṁhṛti* - occurs when a host of characters like the hero, the heroine, helpmates and others assemble together. Varṇa here means the characters, so called as they are described (Varṇyante) (as gathering for the accomplishment of a particular object.)

The ND here mentions the view of others who understand the word Varṇa as four castes, such as Brahmin, Kṣatrīya, etc., and there is an assemblance of two, three or four of these Varṇas at one and the same place.

This view is obviously held by the DR which defines it as an assembly of the four castes[3] and gives the same illustration as given above by the ND.

There is still a third view which defines Varṇasaṁhāra as "repudiation of the described object." Here Varṇa is taken to mean 'varṇita artha' (described object) and Saṁhāra to mean (Saṁ + √ Hṛ to suppress or to withdraw) suppressing, withdrawing, repudiating.

The view seems to refer to the NLR[4]. The illustration is cited from the Veṇī. where Bhānumatī asks Duryodhana to avert the evil effect of the falling of the flag of the chariot by the loud recital of the Vedas by Brahmins[5].

1. ND, p. 79.
2. NS (GOS) XIX, 80.
3. Cf. DR I, 32. ed.
4. NLR, p. 30.
5. Veṇī., p. 48.

It is quite clear that theorists differ on the meaning of the word 'Varṇa'. Abhinava severely criticizes the view of those who take the word Varṇa to mean four castes, considering it to be futile[1]. It can be easily perceived that a drama has more concern with the characters rather than their castes, and hence the view has to be rejected, as Abhinava remarks, looking to the secular atmosphere of drama.

18. *Narma* - is laughter or joke for the sake of sport or enjoyment[2]. Its essence is humour.

The ND gives three illustrations from the RTN (Act II) which comprise jokes between the jester and the king and between Susaṁgatā and Sāgarikā[3]. The purpose of selecting three illustrations from one and the same work is stated to be that it is possible to employ one and the same Sandhyaṅga again and again Similarly the ND gives three humorous illustrations of Narma from Rāmacandra's own work, NLV, e.g., when the king asks Lambastanī to take her seat, the Vidūṣaka humorously points out that the seat was too weak for her to sit and advises her to sit with care[4].

19. *Narmadyuti* - When that particular humorous speech is meant to cover some fault it is called Narmadyuti, e. g. in the RTN (Act II) where Vidūṣaka styles gāthā as a Vedic metre in his attempt to hide his ignorance and provokes king's laughter.[5]

The ND mentions another view under the phrase 'Anye Āhuḥ,' according to which it (Narmadyuti) means 'joy produced by Narma i.e. humorous remark.' This, again, is the view of the DR.[6]

The ND concludes this discussion by a useful remark, viz., these two limbs (Nos. 18 and 19) are to be employed in dramas of love only, because humour fits in them only, as their dominant Vṛtti is Kaiśikī which represents love (and humour)[7].

20. *Tāpa* - (NS-Tāpana) is perceiving a calamity or danger. The illustration is given from the Pārthavijaya[8] where Kañcukī cries for help

1. Yat tu brāhmaṇādivarṇacatuṣṭayamelanaṁ iti tad aphalatvād anādṛtyam eva.- Abhi. III, p. 47.
2. The DR too gives a similar definition. Cf. DR I, 33c.
3. Vide ND, p. 74.
4. Vide ND, p. 75.
5. ND, p. 76. Also Cf. Abhi. III, p. 44. Mark specially the lines commenting upon that, as given by ND which agree with Abhi. almost literally (ND, p. 76, lines 7-8).
6. Cf. the definition of DR I, 33d and the illustration that follows.
7. Cf. ND III, 108.
8. Vide ND, p. 76-77.

to save the queen of Duryodhana assaulted by Gāndharvas and immediately Yudhiṣṭhira takes up his bow in haste.

The ND mentions another view which does not regard this Tāpana as a limb but reads Śamana instead, which is defined as pacification of anger (or anxiety or distress) and averting the evil or danger.

This view is found in the DR which does not recognize Tāpa but reads Śama instead and defines it as alleviation of uneasiness or anxiety or despondency (Arati)[1]. The illustrations, of course, differ, the ND's is from the Pārthavijaya and the DR's from the RTN. Moreover, the ND gives two types of Śamana, viz, pacification of anger, etc., and alleviation of uneasiness. The DR ignores the former.

21. *Puṣpa* – When a sentence uttered excels the one formerly uttered that is known as Puṣpa[2]. Just as a flower decorates the hair, in the same way here the later sentence decorates the earlier one.[3] The ND illustrates from the Vilakṣaduryodhana where Bhīṣma while describing the battle remarks – " Formerly we who were in a great number ready to fight with our weapons saw only one (Arjuna) but afterwards we saw as many Arjunas as we were. "

22. *Pragamana* (*Pragayaṇa*,[4] *Praśamana*[5]) – is a series of questions and answers. There should be two at least in the series. It should consist of clever arguments or witty speeches. It ought to be such as may reveal some important aspect of the plot, character or sentiment.[6]

This limb may be compared with the Vīthyaṅga named Vākkelī which is also defined as a " series of questions and answers – a humorous dialogue ".

23. *Vajra* – is a cruel remark made to one's face It smashes the former speech or action of the opposite party. An apt illustration is provided by the quarrel between Karṇa and Aśvatthāman in the Veṇī. Act III.

24. *Upanyāsa* – is an argument or a trick in order to accomplish a particular object, The ND illustrates from the KTR where Sītā who first refused to get into the areal car of Rāvaṇa was made to do so by threatening her that if she did not obey, he would cut the heads of Brahmins in her presence.

The SD defines this limb as ' conciliation or propitiation (Prasādana) '.

1. Cf. DR I, 33.
2. The definition echoes the NS, cf. NS XIX, 80,
3. Cf. ND p. 78.
4. DR, p. 14 F. N.
5. NS (KM), pp. 314, 316.
6. Vide NLV Act III, p. 39.

25. *Anusarpaṇa* - is the pursuing of a desired object, which though once seen has been lost for the time being. The illustration is given from the Pārthavijaya where Draupadī who has forgotten her insult by Duḥśāsana with the passage of time again remembers it.

The NS mentions this limb as Parisarpa, but the definition does not differ materially from that given by the ND.

After this the ND turns to the limbs of Garbha. They are thirteen in number. The ND here notes that the first eight of the thirteen are subsidiary while the remaining five are principal.

26. *Saṁgraha* - (propitiation). It consists in the use of conciliatory words (Sāma), giving of a gift (Dāna), causing dispute (Bheda), punishment (Daṇḍa), fraud, etc. The illustration is given from the RTN (Act III) where the king is pleased with the Vidūṣaka and gives a gold bracelet in return[1].

The DR too gives the same illustration from the RTN[2]. The ND illustrates Bheda and Daṇḍa also from the Raghuvilāsa.[3]

27. *Rūpa* - is a statement embodying doubt regarding the true nature of something. Rūpa implies indefinite form. This is different from Yukti (of Mukha) which has a definite form and consists in pondering over an action or a task to be accomplished.

The ND illustrates from the KTR where Rāma, not recognizing Jaṭāyu first, says "Is it a mountain with its wings cut off by Indra or the son of Vinatā cut off by demon kings who are his enemies ? Or is it dead Jaṭāyu......?" etc.

It is easy to see here that this limb corresponds to the figure of speech called 'Sandeha' and very probably this limb might have later on developed into the figure of speech of that kind.

This limb can very well be compared with the limb Paribhāvanā of Mukha Sandhi, where too a similar doubt arises in the mind of the person on seeing an object of beauty. Still the difference can very well be seen from the actual illustrations quoted by the ND. In Paribhāvanā the person is dazzled, as it were, by the extraordinary beauty of the object in front and suspects it to be some unearthly creature; while in Rūpa there is a doubt about the real nature of the thing on account of several reasons such as the distance, as a result of which the object is not very clearly perceived. Thus this limb (Rūpa) is much nearer to the figure Sasaṁdeha.

---

1. RTN, p. 65. This illustration is found in Abhi. III, p. 89.
2. Vide DR, p. 18.
3. Vide ND, pp. 82-83.

The ND gives another view. Rūpa is a remark embodying a doubt or apprehension. The illustration is from the RTN (Act III) where the king fears that the love-affair might have been known to the queen.

Clearly enough this view belongs to none else but the DR. The DR (p. 17) gives the same illustration too. This definition of Rūpa much resembles Yukti which consists of thinking over an action or a task with proper discrimination.

According to the third view Rūpa or Rūpaka means 'a speech with striking sense'.[1] The illustration that is quoted is a novel description of war as given by Sundaraka in the Veṇī.

The NLR defines Rūpa as a hypothesis having a striking sense, which corresponds to the above view, but illustrates it from the RTN III, 2.

28. *Anumāna* - is an inference or deduction on the basis of characteristic sign (Liṅga or Hetu)[2].

The ND, following the Abhi[3]., points out the distinction between Anumāna and Yukti, viz., in the former there is a definite conclusion or decision while in the latter there is merely a surmise or guessing. Thus the two are totally distinct[4].

The ND illustrates this from the Svapnavāsavadatta of Bhāsa. Finding slab in the Śephālikā bower warm and the flowers crushed under feet Udayana infers that some one who was already sitting there has left the place instantly on seeing him arrive[5].

It is easy to see that this limb later on develops into the figure Anumāna.

29. *Prārthanā* - is an entreaty or request for love, joy, festivity, etc., appropriate to the ultimate end or fruit to be obtained. The ND illustrates from the Devīcandragupta, Act IV where the hero entreats Mādhavasenā for the union[6].

The ND mentions the view of 'others' who define it as a mere entreaty or request of any kind[7].

1. It is not quite clear as to whose view is mentioned here. NS (GOS) Vol. III too in the foot note on p 48 mentions the same view

   It seems on a closer analysis that according to this view, Rūpa will mean a novel or graphic description, thus forming the base of Svabhāvokti.
2. The definition of the ND seems to be more scientific than that of the NS which defines it as conception of a thing on the basis of a similar one. Cf. NS (GOS) XIX, 85 Here the word Rūpa is rather confusing.
3. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 49.
4. Cf. ND, p. 84.
5. In fact this verse is not found in the Svapna that is available at present.
6. Vide ND, p. 84.
7. The view seems to belong to the NLR (p. 32).

Some do not accept this limb as well as the earlier one, viz, Anumāna. The DR does not recognize Prārthanā but does accept Anumāna.

30. *Udāhṛti*[1] – is an exaggerated speech. The ND, following the Abhi., illustrates it from the RTN III, 2, where Udayana wonders as to how mind which is by its very nature unsteady and difficult to be hit at is smitten by cupid by all his arrows simultaneously[2].

The DR illustrates from the RTN, where Vidūṣaka says that the king will be pleased more by hearing the good news than he would be by acquiring the domain of Kauśalas[3].

The word Udāharaṇa in common parlance is used in the sense of 'an illustration' but here it conveys a special sense; 'Ud' is in the sense of 'excellence' and Ā+Hṛ., means 'to speak'. This sort of exaggeration is at the root of all figures of speech[4].

31. *Krama* – is the discovery of the feeling of another person by one's imagination and intelligence[5]. The ND illustrates it from the Devīcandragupta where Candragupta reads the feeling of Dhruvadevī.[6]

The ND mentions the view of 'others' who define it as 'the acquisition of an object which is already being thought of', e.g., in the RTN, Vidūṣaka arranges a meeting between the King and Sāgarikā who was already being thought of[7].

The ND refers to still another view according to which Krama means acquisition of the future object. The illustration is found in the Veṇī. when Kṛpa points out to Duryodhana that the son of Droṇa has resolved to bear the huge burden of war. Being invested with supreme command by Duryodhana he is capable of uprooting the three worlds even, what to talk about the forces of Yudhiṣṭhira ? Clearly this view refers to the NIR[8]. The illustration is also the same as given by the NLR.

32. *Udvega* -- is fear caused by theives, kings, enemies or the heroine (i. e. the elder queen), etc., e. g., in the MṚC Cārudatta is afraid of the king on account of the charge of theft levelled against him[9]. The definition of the NS runs as follows :-"The fear from King's enemies or Dasyus

1. NS & DR call it Udāharaṇa.
2. The illustration contains an element of contrast and thus forms the figure Virodha. The same illustration is found in Abhi. III, p. 48.
3. RTN, p. 64.
4. Cf. Saiṣā Sarvatra Vakroktiḥ...etc. – KL (of Bhāmaha) II, 85.
5. ND, pp. 85–86. The definition echoes NS XIX, 84.
6. ND, p. 86.
7. The view belongs to the DR and the illustration also is the same.
8. NLR, p. 32.
9. Cf. ND, p. 87.

is known as Udvega". The ND has followed this. The ND in the explanation adds the fear from the elder queen too. This is in accordance with the Abhi. The Abhi. takes the word 'enemy' in the sense of 'the queen". In a drama of love the enemies cannot have much scope. There the word should be taken in the sense of those who put obstacles on the path of the hero in his love-affair. The Abhi. accordingly illustrates from the RTN where the king and the Vidūṣaka dread the arrival of the queen Vāsavadattā[1]. The ND, following Abhinava, adds the word Nāyikā in the explanation.

The ND adds another instance of Udvega from the RTN where Sāgarikā through the fear of the queen makes up her mind to commit suicide[2].

33. *Vidrava* – is apprehension of some obstacle or dreadful object. It is so called because it causes the heart to melt or soften. Udvega implies the danger that has already approached, while Vidrava implies the possibility of the attack.

The ND here criticizes the view of those who recognize Saṁbhrama instead of Vidrava, defining it as fear and trembling. This view is held by the DR[3]. This Saṁbhrama is included in the two Angas, Vidrava and Udvega.

34. *Ākṣepa*[5] – is the revelation of the germ which is employed in Prāptyāśā and which is the cause of the final attainment of the fruit, e.g., in the Veṇī. the charioteer speaks, "Droṇa could not save the king of Sindhus from the son of Pṛthā, ...etc."[6]

Here the ND gives another alternative explanation, viz., when the Bija which is the desire concealed in one's heart is brought out it is known as Ākṣepa, just as in the RTN the words of the king who takes Vāsavadattā as his dear Sāgarikā and describes her beauty reveal the secret love of the king for Sāgarikā[7].

The ND adds here that 'some' do not recognize this limb[4].

35. *Adhibala* – is defined as 'superiority of intellectual power or superiority of fraud or cunningness'[8]. The ND explains that when of the two

1. Cf. RTN III, p. 75.
2. Cf. RTN III, p. 78.
3. Cf. DR I, 42b.
4. NS calls it Ākṣipti
5. Veṇī. IV, 2
6. RTN III, 11.
7. It is difficult to trace who are the persons referred to here as 'Kecit.'
8. Here the two readings betray a double meaning. The actual definition is 'chalādhikya', i.e. superiority of cunningness which finally agrees with the definition of the NS which defines it as deceiving by fraud (*Cf. NS XIX, 87*), *but in the commentary, while explaining the definition, the word is replaced by* Bala i.e. power such as that of the intellect.

persons bent upon deceiving each other if one succeeds by virtue of his superior strength, intelligence, friends, etc., it forms an instance of Adhibala, so called because there is superiority (Adhi) of strength (Bala) in the matter of fraud[1]; e. g. in the RTN (Act III) the king has been deceived by Vāsavadattā dressed as Sāgarikā on account of the stupidity of the Vidūṣaka[2].

Others, notes the ND, define Adhibala as fruitlessness or failure of the deceit or fraud; e. g., in the RTN the king entreats the queen, "O queen! Here shall I, who am full of shame, wipe off with my head the reddish tint of your feet...etc.,"[3]

Here the efforts of the king to deceive Vāsavadattā do not meet with success[4].

The ND refers to still a third view according to which Adhibala consists in a sentence embodying taunt.[5].

36. *Mārga* - is speaking out what is true[6]. In its gloss the ND explains it as a sentence embodying general truth applied to the relevant context. The ND illustrates from Rāmacandra's own work Raghuvilāsa. (Act IV) where Rāvaṇa utters the truth that path of love is peculiar and indiscriminate as Sītā abstained from Rāvaṇa, the Lord of Laṅkā, and loved Rāma who lived the life of a forester.

37. *Asatyāharaṇa*[7] - is deception or fraud. The illustration is from the Māl. (Act IV) where the Vidūṣaka feigns a serpant-bite and thus deceives the people.

38. *Toṭaka* - (Troṭaka-SD) is a speech full of excitement or agitation due to anger, joy, and the like. It is so called because it breaks (wounds) the heart ('Tuṭ' (causal) to break)[8].

---

1. The explanation of ND follows Abhi. III, p. 57.
2. The same illustration is found in Abhi.
3. RTN III, 14.
4. This view seems to refer to the NLR or the DR. The definition by the NLR verbally agrees with the view even though the illustrations differ (Vide NLR, p. 32). The DR supplies two definitions of Adhibala. According to one definition Adhibala constitutes deceit (Adhisaṁdhi), while according to the other Adhibala consists in overturning the plot or rendering others' plan fruitless. The same illustration as quoted by the ND is found in the DR too. The two views do not differ substantially. According to both, in Adhibala there is an element of fraud or deceit as one party tries to befool the other and the one having superior intellect succeeds.
5. Vide ND, p. 90. It is difficult to trace whose view is referred to here.
6. *The definition literally follows NS (GOS) XIX, 83.*
7. NS (DR too) calls it Abhūtāharaṇa.
8. Toṭayati bhinatti hṛdayaṁ iti-ND, p. 91; also Cf. Abhi. III, p. 51.

The ND illustrates from the Raghuvilāsa (Act IV) where Rāvaṇa is overjoyed in anticipation of Sītā's love[1].

Now the ND turns to the thirteen limbs of Avamarśa. The first nine of these beginning with Drava, are employed according to the need or occasion while the remaining four are used prominently.

39. *Drava* - is disrespect to a respectable person[2], e. g., in the RTN, disregarding the husband who was personally present, Vāsavadattā puts into fetters Vidūṣaka and Sāgarikā[3].

40. *Prasaṅga* - is mentioning the great (i. e. one's elders) in a revered manner. Just as in the Veṇī. Yudhiṣṭhira remembers his ancestors and pays homage to them by offering them libations of water[4].

The ND mentions another view according to which Prasaṅga means 'an irrelevant speech', e. g., in the Veṇī. Yudhiṣṭhira laments the death of Bhīma (being deceived by the demon in the disguise of an ascetic).[5]

It may be noted that the view referred to here belongs to Bhoja. The illustration too is the same as in the SP.

41. *Sampheṭa* - (altercation) is an angry speech, e g., in the Veṇī. the passage which reports exchange of hot words between Bhīma and Duryodhana[6].

42. *Apavāda* - is censure of one's own faults or of others. Thus Apavāda is of two types - (i) finding one's own fault, e.g., in the Puṣpadūṣitaka the Brahmin abhors his own self[7]. (ii) Finding the faults of others, e.g., in the Raghuvilāsa Act VII, Mārīca exposes the faults of Rāvaṇa[8].

43. *Chādana* - (Sādana-NLR) is the wiping out of one's own insult. In the RTN Sāgarikā wished, when the magic fire blazed forth, that it was her good luck that the burning fire would put an end to all her miseries[9].

Here the ND mentions the view of 'others' who hold that Chādana means swallowing an insult in order to attain a particular object, e.g., in a play called Anaṅgasenāharinandin (written by Śuktivāsakumāra) the hero Harinandin brought ill name for himself by accepting the crime of theft with a view to saving the Brahmin.

---

1. Cf. ND, p. 92.
2. Vide NS XIX, 90, DR I, 45.
3. ND takes this illustration from Abhi. III, p. 53.
4. Vide Veṇī. VI, p. 184.
5. Cf. SP (MS), pp. 222-223; also Cf. NLR, p. 35.
6. Cf. Veṇī. VI, 10-11.
7. Cf. ND, p. 94.
8. Cf. ND, p 94.
9. RTN IV. The illustration seems to be taken from Abhi. III, p. 56.

This view has been followed by the SD. Bharata defines it as a statement or speech arising out of disgrace and made with some purpose.

Others do not recognize this limb and read 'Chalana' instead[1], which is defined as 'insult', e. g., in the RBh, the insult of Sītā by forsaking her constitutes Chalana.

Others define Chalana as 'infatuation' (Vyāmoha)[2], e. g., in the Veṇī. VI, being deceived by the demon in the disguise of an ascetic king Yudhiṣṭhira and Draupadī fall into a swoon.

44. *Dyuti* implies censure (or rebuking). The ND illustrates it from the Kṛtyārāvaṇa where Aṅgada rebukes Mandodarī.

Here the ND mentions the view of 'Some' who define it as Tarjana (reprimanding or threatening pointing to the contempt or ridicule) and Udvejana (hurting the feelings, frightening)[3] and others who define it as Tarjana and Ādharṣaṇa (hurting) but both the views take Dyuti as any remark which is directly or indirectly meant to insult and thus are included in the above-mentioned definition of the ND.

45. *Kheda* – is fatigue, physical or mental, e. g., in the Vikram. Purūravas says, "Oh, I am tired. Let me enjoy the cold breezes....etc." This suggests physical fatigue.

At times this exhaustion may be physical and mental as well[4].

The ND makes a note here. In fact Śrama or Kheda, Udvega, Vitarka etc. are Vyabhicāris, still they are mentioned in the list of Sandhyaṅgas also in order that they my go to strengthen a particular Rasa.

46. *Virodha*[5] - is an impediment or obstacle in the way of attaining the desired aim, e g., in the KTR Act VII the chamberlain tells Lakṣmaṇa, Vibhīṣaṇa and others that Sītā herself entered fire on seeing the head of Rāma fraudulently created by the magical powers of Rāvaṇa.

Here the ND points out that some do not recognize Kheda and Virodha and mention Vidrava and Vicalana instead[6]. Here the Vidrava is

1. The reference is to the DR as it does not recognize the above limb. Even the illustration from Rāmābhyudaya agrees with that of the DR.
2. It is difficult to see who hold this view.
3. Cf. DR I, 46 b.
4. Vide ND, p. 97.
5. NS & DR (I. 47b) call it Virodhana. Abhi. calls it Nirodhana. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 35.
6. It is quite obvious that by 'Anye' here the ND seems to refer to the DR which mentions Vidrava and Vicalana; still however one point has to be remembered here. The DRI. does not mention Kheda but does mention Virodhana which it defines as angry speech. It is difficult to understand in this case the difference between Virodha and Saṁpheṭa which also means angry speech. The illustrations of both as given by the DR do not differ in sense.

taken to mean an attempt to slaughter, bind etc. The resolve of killing can be illustrated from the MṚC (Act X) where Cārudatta is taken to the gallows.

Vidrava occurs even when haste or confusion is implied. Just as in the Veṇī. Yudhiṣṭhira says, " Who, who is there ? Bring the bow together with the quiver. Is there any attendant here ? " This clearly shows haste and confusion.

Vicalana means bragging[1] on account of valour, family, learning, physical charms, good fortune, etc., e. g., in the Venī. V, 27 Arjuna waxes eloquent over his great feat and hence it is Vicalana.

It will be easily seen that in this case Vicalana becomes identical with Saṁrambha which is defined as 'proclamation of one's own power'[2].

47. *Saṁrambha* – is proclaiming one's own strength or power, e.g., in the Veṇī. Bhīma thunders (before Duryodhana), " O fool ! That you were made to give vent to your sorrow, like a woman, by means of your tears and that you were made to witness the tearing of the chest of of your brother—this is the reason why you, an unworthy king, were allowed to live (so long), when Bhīmasena, an elephant to the lotus-pond of your family, was enraged."[3] There needs not be wrath or anger, e. g., in the Veṇī. (VI, 6) Yudhiṣṭhira's speech to Draupadī describing the valour of Bhīma is devoid of wrath.

The ND explains the difference between Saṁpheta and the Saṁrambha. In the former there is simply an angry speech while in the latter there is a proclamation of one's strength also.

The DR does not mention Saṁrambha but its definition of Vicalana resembles this limb.

48. *Śakti* – is that limb where pacification of one who is angry is made by one's power of intellect, or when the angry foe is completely destroyed, e. g., in the RTN (IV, 1) the king's speech shows that the anger of Vāsavadattā standing in the way of the acquisition of Sāgarikā in pacified.

Some define Śakti as " pacification of opposition "[4]. The illustration is from the UTR (VI, 11)[5] where Lava's opposition to Candraketu and his army is allayed at the sight of Rāma.

---

1. The definition is in accordance with the DR which defines it as bragging. The illustration that follows, also, is verbally copied from the DR, cf. DR, p. 26.
2. ND, p. 99.
3. Veṇī. V, 33, (ND, p. 99). The same has been quoted by the DR to illustrate Virodhana (DR, p. 25.)
4. The view refers to DR. Vide DR, p. 23.
5. The same illustration is quoted by the DR (p. 23).

Here some regard another limb called Bhāvāntara which occurs when the expressed intention is quite opposite to the real intention, e. g., in the Tāpasavatsarāja (Act VI) Yaugandharāyaṇa, who really wants Vāsavadattā to refrain from ending her life, says, however, " Vinītaka, make a pyre ". Here the act of making a pyre, which is opposed to his intention of saving Vāsavadattā is performed with a different view altogether.

There are others who do not recognize Śakti but read Ājñā instead, which they define as 'an order' through anger without considering appropriateness or otherwise of the same.

The ND remarks that there are thus differences of opinion regarding the subdivisions in all Sandhis and these different views are to be considered authentic as they have been recognized by the old authorities and as they constitute varieties of striking speech.

49. *Prarocanā* - is the representation of the accomplishment of the desired object in advance which is to follow in the Nirvahaṇa Sandhi. It is so called because the object of the play is shown here in bright colours (Pra + Ruc). The illustration is cited from the Veṇī. where the braiding of Draupadī's hair and coronation of Yudhiṣṭhira are represented in advance as accomplished when Pāñcālaka says, " Enough of doubt. Let the jars, studded with jewels, be filled with water for your coronation. And let Kṛṣṇā hold festivity at (the near prospect of) the tying of her braid suspended for an exceedingly long time ".[1]

Some define this limb as " a direction to honour persons with gifts, etc."

Some read Yukti instead of Prarocanā and define it as ' Savicchedokti '.[2]

It should be noted here that this Prarocanā has nothing to do with the Prarocanā, an element of Bhāratī Vṛtti or a limb of Pūrvaraṅga.

50. *Ādāna* - is the vicinity or the foreseeing of the accomplishment of the desired object.[3]

51. *Vyavasāya* - is acquisition of the means to accomplish the desired fruit.

Some define this Aṅga as ' an assertion or mention of one's own strength '[4]. This view (and the illustration that the ND quotes) refers to the DR. But here the ND differs from the DR and points out that

1. Veṇī. VI, 12 (p. 160). This illustration is also found in the DR; cf. DR, pp, 25-26. The explanation also resembles DR-Bhāvino'pi siddhatvena kalpanam.

2. ND, p. 102. This view partly belongs to Bharata who defines this limb as 'Savicchedam vacaḥ' (XIX, 96). But Bharata recognizes Prarocanā as well.

3. Cf. NS XIX, 94 ab. and Abhi. III, p. 55.

4. Cf. Veṇī. VI, 6.

assertion of one's own power is called Saṁrambha (which is defined in the same terms) and it includes this kind of Vyavasāya.

The ND notes here that 'some' hold this Sandhi as well as the Garbha Sandhi to have been comprised of twelve limbs only as they drop any one out of the above thirteen[1]. This point is suggested in the Abhi[2].

Now we come to the fourteen limbs of Nirvahaṇa, all of which are equally important.

52. *Sandhi* - The seed sown in Mukha Sandhi reaches the stage of fruition after undergoing the gradual development (such as sprouting etc.), e. g., in the RTN Vasubhūti says, "Bābhravya, this girl extremely resembles the princess", and Bābhravya too says, "I too have the same (idea) in my mind"[3]. Thus the seed sown in Mukha is brought near fruition.

This limb must be introduced.

53. *Nirodha* - is searching for the desired object which had been lost.

The DR calls this limb Vibodha and defines it as "Vibodhaḥ Kāryamārgaṇam"[4]. i.e. 'The seeking after the end'. The ND here follows the NS.[5]

54. *Grathana* - is the perception of the fruit or the ultimate aim, e g., in the Veṇī, Bhīma speaks, "Pāñcālī, I myself will bind up your hair-braid". Here the final aim, viz., tying of Draupadī's braid is perceived.[6]

55. *Nirṇaya* - is narration of one's own experiences[7]. The illustration is cited from the Yādavābhyudaya where Vasudeva informs: Samudravijaya of the hardships he had to suffer while concealing Kṛṣṇa in Gokula[8].

56. *Paribhāṣā*[9]—is condemning one's own self. The person here introspects and makes a clear confession of one's faults[10]. The ND illustrates from the NLV (Act VII, 9) where Nala condemns himself for his cruel deed of abandoning Damayantī in the lonely forest.

The ND mentions the view of 'some' who define this limb as 'the

1. The DR too mentions twelve omitting Vidrava.
2. Cf. Abhi III. p 56.
3. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 57.
4. Vide DR I, 51 and DR, p. 27.
5. Cf Kāryasyānveṣaṇaṁ yuktyā nirodha iti kīrtitaḥ - NS XIX, 98,
6. DR has the same illustration. Cf. p. 28.
7. Cf. NS XIX, 92.
8. Vide ND. p. 105.
9. NS (and DR)-Paribhāsaṇa.
10. NS defines it as mere censure or condemnation (Parivāda) but Abhinava's commentary explains that the faults confessed belong to the person himself.

conversation of persons with one another' and adds that the passage referred to above can serve as its illustration[1].

This limb has a special significance of its own and is highly essential at this juncture. Here the persons themselves who have done something wrong or who have been in one way or the other responsible for the obstacles against the union of the hero and the heroine regret and repent. Thus this is a sort of happy reconciliation between the two rival parties which is utterly essential in order to bring a happy end. As for instance in the Śāk. Act VII the king repents and falls at the feet of Śakuntalā, or in the Māl. Dhāriṇī repents and willingly consents to the union. Thus the limb is important from various points of view. First it suggests the end of the play. Secondly it also suggests that the end in a Sanskrit drama should be happy. Thirdly it indicates that the dramatist has not to be satisfied merely by the attainment of the object coveted by the hero but there should be a complete psychological reconciliation between the opposite parties.

Thus this limb must be employed.

57. *Upāsti*[2]-is service to others[3], e.g., in the Veṇī, Bhīma congratulates Draupadī that the enemies were destroyed. Here Bhīma delights Draupadī and hence this limb.

The ND here mentions the view of those who read Prasāda in lieu of Upāsti, which is defined as 'propitiation arising out of the performance of pleasant and benevolent deeds to the beloved person'. The limb is illustrated by the TPV, where the king appreciates the benevolence, and loyalty of Rumaṇvat and Yaugandharāyaṇa, his two able ministers[4].

58. *Kṛti* - is maintenance (i.e. protection) of the acquired thing, e.g., in the RTN Vāsavadattā asks her husband to act in such a way that Ratnāvalī may not remember her kinsmen who live far away in Siṁhala-dvīpa.

The ND points out here that some read Dyuti, instead of Kṛti, and

1. The view referred to is that of the DR. It appears that the view of the DR is not so convincing. Mutual talk or dialogue is essential to a drama. There is no speciality about it and, moreover, it becomes totally inexplicable as to why this limb should come at this stage only. Moreover the illustration that the DR gives embodies personal condemnation as defined by the ND. Thus the view of the ND is naturally preferable.

2. The NS and the DR do not mention this but read Prasāda instead, which has the same sense. Cf. NS XIX, 98 and DR I, 52b.

3. ND, p. 109.

4. The illustrations of Abhi. and DR as well differ.

define it as 'removal of things unfavourable to the object acquired'[1]. The illustration is cited from the MDR (Act VII, p. 208) where the causes that are unfavourable to accepting the ministership on the part of Rākṣasa who was already under control are removed and thus he is compelled to accept the ministership in order to save the life of his friend Candanadāsa.

There are others who define Dyuti as 'removal of anger etc. which might have occasionally arisen'. The ND illustrates it from the RTN, where Yaugandharāyaṇa informs the king and the queen of the foretelling of a Siddha, viz., one who marries Ratnāvalī will be a sovereign king and that she was the sister of the queen[2]. This pacifies queen's jealousy and anger for Ratnāvalī. It appears that the ND here anonymously refers to Abhinava who explains the NS XIX, 100 as stated here by the ND.[3]

59. *Ānanda* - is the attainment of one's desire, e.g., in the RTN, Vāsavadattā[4] requests the king to accept Ratnāvalī and the king, overjoyed at the offer, replies, "Who will not honour the gift of the queen?"[5].

60. *Samaya* - is 'escape from misery'[6]. It is the time when misery or misfortune comes to an end. The ND illustrates from the MṚC (Act X) when Śarvilaka comes by the order of Āryaka with the words, "Get away, get away, O rogues..." etc.[7]

61. *Parigūhana* - is 'the experience of something wonderful'. The ND illustrates from the RBh. Sītā repudiated by Rāma enters fire and behind the curtain we hear the sound and uproar of astounded people and there enters the god of fire carrying Sītā. All stand up in wonder and bow to him. Here we find Adbhuta as Sītā who once entered fire is again brought to life. Illustrations are cited also from the RV and the Puṣpadūṣitaka. In the latter the ND points out that as many as nine limbs are contained in a single verse[8].

1. 'Apare' here seems to refer to the NS. The NS does not regard Kṛti, of course, there is not much of difference (in sense) between the two (Dyuti and Kṛti). DR regards Kṛti but the definition faithfully echoes the one of Dyuti as found in NS. Vide DR I, 53a.
2. Vide RTN, Act IV, pp. 110-11.
3. Abhi. III, p. 58, lines 11-12.
4. Cf. NS XIX, 100 Cd.
5. The illustration agrees with that of Abhi. III, p. 58.
6. ND I, 64.
7. MṚC, p. 109.
8. Cf. ND, pp. 110-111.

62. *Bhāṣaṇa* - is speech accompanied by sweet words, gifts and the like. This is illustrated from the MṚC[1] (Act X) where Śarvilaka, at the instance of Āryaka, confers fovours on Cārudatta, Vasantasenā and others.

This limb is absolutely essential in the construction of a play.

63. *Pūrvabhāva* - (Prāgbhāva[2]) It is the anticipation or foreseeing of Kārya, e.g., in the RTN Yaugandharāyaṇa says, "Having realised this, your honour (the queen) is the authority in doing whatever you like to your sister", and then Vāsavadattā's sarcastic comment, viz., "Why don't you clearly say, 'Give Ratnāvalī to the king?'" Here Vāsavadattā perceives the Kārya undertaken by Yaugandharāyaṇa[3].

Some read Pūrvavākya instead of this limb and define it as a speech similar to the earlier one already spoken in the earlier Sandhis such as Mukha etc. The illustration is cited from the MDR (Act VI) where Cāṇakya says, 'Let the bonds of all except those of horses and elephants be untied. I only who have made good my vow, will tie up my tuft of hair," as it contains words which had earlier been uttered in the Mukha Saṁdhi.

Here it may be noted that the NS also reads Pūrvavākya which it defines as reproducing what has already been said earlier by a character. By 'Kecit' the ND probably refers to the NS.

64. *Kāvyasaṁhāra* - is the desire to give a boon. This is represented by the question, "What may I do to please you further?" This indicates the fulfilment of the desire of the hero and the eagerness of the speaker to render service or help to the hero still further. This attainment of the end marks the end of the play and hence this limb is known as Kāvyasaṁhāra i.e. conclusion of the play.

The ND points out that this limb must be employed and should precede Praśasti.

Here we see a simple but an important trait of the Sanskrit drama in general. All dramas end with this type of remark or rather query (where a man of superior ability expresses a desire to do good to the hero.)

65. *Praśasti* - is a prayer for good things. This is uttered by the hero or some other important character. The ND illustrates from the KTR and the YBh[4], both of which contain good wishes for all.

---

1. ND, pp. 111-12.
2. The ND clarifies this point at the end of the discussion, viz., that this difference of name while actually defining is due to the metrical demand. Cf. ND, p. 113.
3. The same illustration is found in the Abhi. as an illustration of Dyuti (Abhi. III, p. 54).
4. The ND, p. 115.

This limb has got to be used. This is also known popularly as Bharatavākya, probably because it was uttered by all the actors. The play should always end with such a desire of common good. It is regarded by some as a part for the story or plot itself and not as a limb of Nirvahaṇa. This is how the number will be sixty four and not sixty five[1]. The first three limbs of this Sandhi viz, Sandhi, Nirodha and Grathana and and the last three, viz., Pūrvabhāva, Kāvyasaṁhāra, and Praśasti are used in this Sandhi only, while the rest of the limbs may be used in other Sandhis also according to the needs of the plot-development. Here also they are used only if they are required.

The ND points out the purpose of the Sandhyaṅgas once again. They are employed in order to maintain the continuity of the plot, which is highly essential for developing (Puṣṭi) a Rasa. If the story breaks or does not flow in continuity the dominant states etc. will also lose their corresponding continuity with the result that the audience will not be able to enjoy Rasa.

The ND thus lays stress on the point that the purpose of the Sandhyaṅgas is ultimately to develop Rasa which is the ultimate aim of a dramatist. But while achieving this aim a dramatist should see that the limbs are employed so naturally. They should not give an appearance of artificiality or labouredness on the part of the writer himself in some how introducing them to satisfy the requirements of Sanskrit drama and then only the Sahṛdayas can enjoy them.

The ND adds that the Aṅgas are of the nature of the Sthāyi bhāva, Vibhāva, Anubhāva and Vyabhicāri bhāvas[2]. They are employed in the different Sandhis in keeping with propriety. This sense of propriety is mastered by great poets whose aim is to develop Rasa only and not by inferior poets who indulge themselves in the employment of striking words and sense only.

Moreover, in order to achieve the above-stated end a dramatist may employ one and the same limb twice or thrice or even more, e. g., in the Veṇī. Saṁpheta and Vidrava are employed again and again in order to develop Vīra and Raudra. So also in the RTN Vilāsa is often employed to develop Śṛṅgāra. But, beware ! Avoid extremes. Do not use a particular Anga over and over again in your zest to develop a Rasa as too mush of every thing creates insipidity. A dramatist should be economical.

1. ND, p. 115 lines 12-13.

1. Ibid, p. 115 lines 19-20.

The principle of economy is important not merely in life but in literature too. A playwright should not employ two limbs where one serves the purpose[1].

The problem of employing the Sandhyaṅgas is left to the artistic sense of the playwright. It is he who has to decide as to when, where, how and how many times a particular limb should be employed. There can be no hard and fast rule which can dictate its use. Poetry is an art and cannot be bound by rigorous rules. It is the outcome of natural talents which cannot be fettered by blind rules. Thus sense of propriety i.e., the theory of Aucitya is rightly esteemed by the ND.

The ND's view about the place of the Sandhyaṅgas in the plot is equally clear and apt. These limbs are means to an end (and not an end in themselves)-means to develop Rasa. Rasa reigns supreme in a drama and all other paraphernalia is meant to develop that supreme Rasa only. The ND, therefore, strikes a note of warning for those lesser poets who give undue importance to the external beauties of word and sense and ignore the chief element, Rasa[2].

The above discussion of Sandhyaṅgas makes the following points quite clear :—

1. The order of Sandhyaṅgas, excepting at a few places where it is specifically laid down, is not important.

2. One and the same Sandhyaṅga may be repeated twice, thrice or even on more occasions.

3. Sandhyaṅgas of a particular juncture need not be employed in that Sandhi only. They may occur at any suitable situation. The fact that they are the limbs of a particular juncture simply indicates that they are more usually found in that particular juncture.

4. All Sandhyaṅgas need not be employed in one drama. Only those which are relevant and useful to the plot-development ought to be employed.

5. The chief purpose of drama is to develop Rasa. The Sandhyaṅgas should be employed as a means to the above end (and not as an end in themselves).

---

1. The ND illustrates from the Pratimāniruddha where the author does away with Parikara as its sense is understood in the Upakṣepa. Similarly, in the Rādhāvipralambha Parikara and Parinyāsa are not employed, both being included in the Upakṣepa (ND, pp. 115-16).

2. It unluckily happened that the rules which were originally meant as an aid to the dramatist were followed rigidly by the later playwrights and they took pride in exhibiting their knowledge of the same. The result was that the dramas lost their individuality and appeared as a cast in the same mould.

At the end the ND refers to a view of 'Some' who accept twenty one other Sandhyantaras over and above the sixty four. These limbs are:-

(1) Sāma (2) Bheda (3) Daṇḍa (4) Dāna (5) Vadha (6) Pratyutpannamatitva (7) Gotraskhalita (8) Sāhasa (9) Bhaya (10) Bhī[1] (11) Māyā (12) Krodha (13) Ojas (14) Saṁvaraṇa (15) Bhrānti (16) Hetvavadhāraṇa (17) Dūta (18) Lekha (19) Svapna (20) Citra (21) Mada.

The ND does not accept these twenty one as independent limbs. Out of these, Sāma, Bheda etc. are not separate limbs by themselves as they can be included in Saṅgraha, a limb of Garbha Sandhi, which comprises of Sāma, Dāna, etc. Pratyutpannamatitva etc. are of the nature of the Vyabhicārīs[2]. Dūta, Lekha, Svapna, Citra etc., are of the nature of the plot and the rest can be included in some limb or the other (amongst the above-mentioned sixty four), e g., in the Udāttarāghava, Upakṣepa is of the nature of Hetvavadhārana, in the Pratimāniruddha it is of the nature of Svapna, in the Rāmābhyudaya, of Bhaya, in the Veṇī., of Krodha. Similarly, the rest also can be included in some or the other of the remaining limbs.

These twenty one Sandhyantaras have been originally mentioned by Bharata[3]. The ND has bodily lifted these verses from the NS. The ND simply mentions these "other varieties of Saṁdhis" without giving their definitions. The NS also does not define them.

The ND does not recognize the so called 'Sandhyantaras'. It states the grounds for rejecting them. They are based on the Abhinavabhāratī[4]. Abhinava, however, rightly remarks ' These are the Vibhāvas etc., meant for guiding the playwright.

---

1. Originally the ND reads 'Dbhī' which the editor corrects as 'Bhī' in the bracket. But in view of the NS from which these verses appear to have been quoted the correct reading seems to be Hrī (Cf. NS XIX, 106) and not Bhī. Moraover Bhī would be as good as Bhaya which immediately precedes it.
2. In fact Bhaya and Krodha are Sthāyī bhāvas of Bhayānaka and Raudra Rasas respectively.
3. Vide NS (KM) XIX, 104-7.
4. Abhi, Vol. III, pp. 63-64.

CHAPTER II

ELEVEN TYPES OF RŪPAKAS-PRAKARAṆA AND OTHERS

In Chapter I the ND deals with Nāṭaka and the various topics connected with it and which are common to all forms of drama, such as Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis, Sandhis, Sandhyaṅgas, etc. The Chapter II treats of the remaining eleven of the twelve types of drama.

Next to Nāṭaka comes a similar type of drama, viz., Prakaraṇa with whose discussion the chapter opens.

1. PRAKARAṆA :

At the outset, the ND gives an etymological explanation of the word Prakaraṇa. The word is derived from Pra + √Kṛ = to make or create completely (i.e. creating independently by one's own imagination). It is so called as the hero, the plot and the fruit - all or one or two of them are the playwright's own creation, created by his own imagination.[1] The main point of difference between Naṭaka and Prakaraṇa lies here. Nāṭaka derives its plot, hero and ultimate fruit from the old works of history or legends while in Prakaraṇa all these or some at least are imaginary, and that is why it is called Prakaraṇa.[2]

Now, about the hero. The hero in a Prakaraṇa should be a merchant, a Brahmin, a minister or a master (swāmī). Any one of these can be the hero but not all, as happens in the case of Samavakāra. Technically, the hero must be of Dhīrodātta or Dhīrapraśānta type. Here the authors of the ND criticize those who propound that the hero must belong to Dhīrapraśānta type only even though he is a minister. They point out that this view is incorrect and contradictory to the old tradition or theory,[3] and they quote the lines from the NS :- "The commander-in-chief and the minister are called Dhīrodātta"[4]. The authors further point out that they have specifically mentioned minister (Saciva) in the Kārikā even though he may be included under a Bania/merchant or a Brahmin, specially to point out that the hero may be Dhīrodātta too for the latter two, viz., a merchant and a Brahmin are reckoned to be Dhīrapraśānta.[5]

1. Cf. Abhi. II, pp. 429-30.
2. Cf. ND, p. 117 line 6.
3. Cf. Vṛddhasampradāyavandhya–ND, p. 117.
4. Cf. NS XXIV, 4.
5. The criticism seems to be levied against the DR. The DR points out that the hero can be either a minister or a Brahmin or a merchant of Dhīrapraśānta type (Cf. DR III, 39-40) but this goes against the dictum of the NS (NS XXIV, 4) which demands that a minister ought to be Dhīrodātta.

The hero is a middle (Madhyama) character technically. He is the creation of the poet's mind. The Brahmins and ministers are high (Uttama) as compared with their own state of society but are not so as compared with the Kings.

Under no circumstances a divine character can be introduced here even in a minor role. In Nāṭaka a divine character can figure in a minor role. The ND provides a rational and logical reason for this. The Prakaraṇa is a drama depicting ordinary human persons and is thus more related to the actual life of the middle and low strata of society which is more full of misery and less possessed of happiness[1], while quite opposite is the case with a divine character.

Heroine :

The heroine is from the lower strata of society (Mandagotrā)[2] or of low character. In that case the hero too should be from low strata. Thus it is not unnatural if the hero suspects some sin in the heroine. This actually happens in the Puṣpadūṣitaka (prakaraṇa) where Samudradatta suspects Nandayantī by hearing the name of Aśokadatta uttered, but this is no fault. In cases of low-born ladies this type of suspician with regard to their relation with a stranger is not improper; on the for a other hand, it is highly improper in the case of high-born characters father-in-law to expel the daughter-in-law from the house when the son is away and equally improper is for that expelled lady to dwell in the house of a Śabara-chief.

That the plot is imaginary should not be taken to mean that anything can be represented at the sweet will of the dramatist. All the actions, movements, behaviour, dress, attendants, etc., should be befitting the character. They should not be such as may be expected of a king or a very low-born character.

If the heroine is a harlot, even immodest reference may be made to her, e. g., in the play Devīcandragupta of Viśākhadatta prince Candragupta addresses Mādhavasenā, a prostitute, rather indecorously -

"O charming-faced lady, somebody who caused tears of joy in your eyes having the brilliance of white lotuses and perspiration in each limb full of horripilation, making expanse of your hips which are already perfect, has untied the knot of your lower garment without touching it"[3].

1. Cf. ND II, 66.

2. Cf. Sukhaduḥkhamohasvabhāva-KP I, 1.

3. The verse is quoted in the same context by Abhi, II, p. 433.

The minor characters or attendants that figure here also should correspond to the social status of the hero and the heroine. A king has Kañcukins, here instead of a Kañcukin we have a servant (Dāsa). Instead of a minister who advises the king in serious matters we have a merchant. In lieu of the Vidūṣaka here we have Viṭas who are equally witty[1]. Similarly other royal paraphernalia too have no scope here, the hero being an ordinary man.

The life depicted here is that of a middle class man for whom the path of life never runs smooth. It is beset with a number of difficulties, calamities and catestrophes through which the hero has to make his way. Thus Prakaraṇa is a drama full of hurries and worries of life as against Nāṭaka where the hero and the heroine have no other business but to love and pine for each other.

Types of Prakarana :

Firstly, Prakaraṇas can be divided into seven types on the basis of the nature of the hero, fruit and plot, according as one or more of them are invented or uninvented. If one of these is invented and the remaining two are uninvented it will totally give us three types. Three more types can be had on the basis of two of the three being invented and one uninvented. There can be one more variety where all the three are invented. Thus in all there will be seven types.[2]

Each of these seven varieties can further be subdivided into three according to the types of the heroine, viz., whether the heroine is born of a high family or a prostitute or both. The total varieties, therefore, will come to be twenty one (7×3). If the family life of a householder is to be depicted then the heroine must be a high-born lady only. In case the writer has no intention of depicting the family life then only a prostitute should be made a heroine. If the author introduces both of these heroines then the hero can be none other than a Viṭa (a paramour).

The play which consists of a high-born lady as well as a harlot is known as a mixed type of Prakaraṇa (Saṅkīrṇa) The Prakaraṇa which

1. Cf. Abhi. II, p. 431.

2. The following table will make the point clearer–

	Hero (Netā)	Fruit (Phala)	Plot (Vastu)
i)	Invented	Uninvented	Uninvented
ii)	Uninvented	Invented	Uninvented
iii)	Uninvented	Uninvented	Invented
iv)	Invented	Invented	Uninvented
v)	Invented	Uninvented	Invented
vi)	Uninvented	Invented	Invented
vii)	Invented	Invented	Invented

consists either of the two only i.e. either a high-born lady or a harlot is called a pure type of Prakarana (Śuddha). Thus Śuddha will have two varieties :-(i) where the heroine is Kulajā only and (ii) where the heroine is a harlot. In all there will be three varieties and each will have seven varieties as mentioned above. Thus fourteen varieties of Śuddha Prakaraṇa and seven varieties of Sankīrṇa Prakaraṇa will ultimately give us twenty one varieties of Prakaraṇa[1].

The authors of the ND add that there can be further varieties of Prakaraṇa on the basis of the heroine being invented (Kalpitā) or uninvented (Akalpitā); but these have been ignored because they are not found in any Prakaraṇa.

The ND refers to the view of "some" who consider the Mṛcchakaṭika being full of rogues (Dhūrta) as a "Mixed" type of Prakaraṇa despite the fact that the hero is a merchant. According to the ND the MṚC is Śuddha type having a prostitute as the heroine The view referred to here appears to belong to the DR who mentions the MṚC as a Saṅkīrṇa type[2]. According to the ND in the mixed type of Prakaraṇa there is a mixture of a high-bred lady and a prostitute, but at the same time the hero should be a paramour (Viṭa).

The ND adds that all the rest of things in a Prakaraṇa such as the number of Acts, Sandhis, Vṛttis, Rasas, etc., correspond to those in a Nāṭaka, excepting the predominance of Kaiśikī Vṛtti that we find in Nāṭaka, the reason being that in Prakarana there is abundance of misery and, therefore, love and humour get a subordinate position as happens in the MṚC, the Puṣpadūṣitaka, the Taraṅgadatta and other Prakaraṇas. The ND here criticizes Bhavabhūti for employing Kaiśikī in exuberance in his Mālatīmādhava, which, as the ND remarks, is against the opinion of the Vṛddhas.

Then the ND, by way of summarizing, remarks that one who is interested in the historical (or well-known) personages may compose a

1.

In giving this large number of varieties of Prakaraṇa the ND has followed the Abhi. though the ND is more clear and systematic Cf. Abhi. II, p. 433 lines 10-11.

2. Cf. Kitavadyūtakarādidhūrtasaṁkulaṁ tu mṛcchakaṭikādivat saṁkīrṇaprakaraṇam iti.-DR, p. 72.

a Nāṭaka with high type of hero such as a king and the like while the one who is interested in an imaginary story may undertake to write a Prakaraṇa with a middle class hero such as a merchant and the like.

The ND finally remarks that the purpose of all dramatic compositions is to keep the evil-minded or stupid persons on the righteous path.

Critical Remarks :

The criticism of the Mālatīmādhava as given by the authors of the ND is not unjustified. In a Prakaraṇa the purpose of the poet is to portray society as it is in its rank and file. Prakaraṇa is purely a social play. It mirrors the vicissitudes–the weal and the woe–of a common man who is the hero of the play. (All the characters also are the true representatives of the common masses.) And for a common man especially the path of life is full of ups and downs. Prakaraṇa should, therefore, reflect both these aspects of life, as we find in the MṚC. Prakaraṇa is thus not a play of love and laughter only but it is a play of real conflict, and that is why the ND prohibits the exuberance of Kaiśikī in it.

The authors of the ND here once again reiterate that the purpose of art is (not simply recreation but) to lead the immoral persons to to the path of morality. Art should not only be moral but also be capable of inspiring morality in others[1].

The Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa are two of the full-fledged perfect forms of Sanskrit drama. But in the Nāṭaka the dramatist draws the plot from epics or mythology, while in Prakaraṇa the story is invented. The latter, therefore, gives full scope to the creative art and the imaginative faculty of the poet.

There is another important element which distinguishes the Nāṭaka from the Prakaraṇa. Nāṭaka has an atmosphere of kingly grandeur. Both the hero and the heroine come from noble (royal) families. The hero is of the sublime type (Dhīrodātta). The characters also are usually drawn from the upper classes of society. Contrary is the case in the Prakaraṇa. There the hero is an ordinary man. The heroine is more often a prostitute rather than a high-born woman. The other characters also are drawn from the lower strata of society. It depicts coarse and more popular side of life[2] while in the Nāṭaka, the poet presents what is conceived as the highest type of human personality.

1. The point has been brought home by the ND while explaining the benedictory verse.

2. In this respect it can be well compared with Bhāṇa or Prahasana, even though the latter, on account of their utter gross elements which entirely pervade the story, did not get sanction from the cultured upper class of society.

Prof. Wilson in this connection remarks that "the Hindu writers multiply species very gratuitously and make distinctions where no difference is discernible "[1].

2. *NĀṬIKĀ* :

After the discussion of Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa the ND takes up another type of Rūpaka, viz, Nāṭikā. Nāṭikā in fact has not been recognized by most of the authors as an independent form of drama but as a minor play (Uparūpaka) derived from the principal types of drama, viz., Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa. As the very name suggests Nāṭikā may be taken as a dimunitive form (as the feminine gender suggests smallness, together with delicacy and tinyness) of Nāṭaka. Nāṭaka is a full-fledged drama in five to ten Acts with historical theme furnished with all Avasthās, Sandhis and also Sandhyaṅgas. Nāṭikā is a short piece with only four Acts. The hero is a king as in Nāṭaka. But the king is to be described as Dhīralalita. As the principal sentiment is Śṛṅgāra and the corresponding Vṛtti Kaiśikī, it is essential that the hero too ought to be of Dhīralalita type. Theme also requires preponderance of female characters, who present graceful and delicate Abhinaya.

Nāṭikā is a combination of both, Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa. If the hero is taken from Nāṭaka the plot is derived from Prakaraṇa and has, therefore, to be imaginary. The development of the plot as also the fruit and means of achieving it rests on the inventive genius of the poet himself. Other Vṛttis may occur but Kaiśikī should dominate. Songs, dancing, music, humour etc. should be in abundance.

There are two heroines simultaneously in a Nāṭikā, one is the queen who is the married wife of the hero while the other is an unmarried girl[2]. Each of the two may be either well-known or not so well-known. This will lead to the four varieties of Nāṭikā[3].

The principal heroine i.e. the queen who deserves importance on account of her noble birth, serenity, married state, etc., should herself bring about the union of the hero and the virgin heroine at the end of the play. Till such time, i.e., before this approval of the queen takes place, the growth of love between the hero and the heroine is to be

1. Dramas, p. 28.

2. The DR remarks that she should be a Mugdhā.

3.

	Queen	Heroine
i)	Not well-known	Well-known
ii)	Not well-known	Not well-known
iii)	Well-known	Well-known
iv)	Well-known	Not well-known

shown by arranging secret meetings at a rendezvous but all the while the hero is afraid of the queen.

The queen should be intelligent and shrewd. The maiden heroine should be depicted as innocent, bashful and devoid of shrewdness; of course, both are born in high Kṣatriya family and are possessed of noble qualities such as love, justice, modesty, bashfulnees, dignity, serinity, etc. The queen gets angry as she comes to know of the King's fascination for the maiden, the King consequently pacifies and propitiates her. The queen puts obstacles in the way of the meeting between the King and the heroine, who secretly love each other. Thus all try to deceive one another.

Nāṭikā is explained etymologically by the ND. The root is Naṭ or Nāṭ (Causal) to make dance+Ṅī (i.e. 'ī') termination which ultimately gives the word "Nāṭī" - 'that which makes the minds of the learned dance with joy'. Then termination "Kap" is affixed in the sense of smallness or dimunitive which gives the word Nāṭikā as the plot of Nāṭikā is small. The feminine noun suggests preponderance of ladies and exuberance of delicacy and tenderness.

Remarks :

The characteristics given below by the ND are the same as given by the NS[1] and the DR[2]. The Abhi. states that four Aṅgas of Kaiśikī should be there. The ND states that Aṅgas of Śṛṅgāra, viz., song, dance, music, humour, etc., should occur.

The varieties of Nāṭikā seem to be on the basis of the theory of Śaṅkuka who divides it into eight types on the basis of the fact whether the queen or the heroine is well known or otherwise. The view is quoted by the Abhi.[3] These varieties evidently appear to be unessential. It reflects the mind of an Indian theorist who has a great fascination for the divisions and subdivisions even on the basis of apparently minor points probably to give the subject an air of serenity and scientific treatment.

As regards the Sandhis of Nāṭikā the NS is silent. Hemacandra writes in his own commentary on the KS that one of the Avasthās may be included in some other Avasthā i.e. there should be four Avasthās (as the acts are four)[4]. The BP opines that there should be four Sandhis excluding Avamarśa[5]. The ND holds that it should have all the five Sandhis. The RS refers to the view of those who believe that Nāṭikā

1. NS XVIII, 59-60.
2. DR III, 43-48.
3. Abhi. II, p. 436.
4. KS, p. 437.
5. BP, p. 244.

does not have Avamarśa and refutes it by pointing out that the RTN has all the five Sandhis[1]. The SD admits of Vimarśa in Nāṭikā but points out that it should be short-lived[2].

4. PRAKARAṆĪ OR PRAKARAṆIKĀ

Prakaraṇī has been disposed off with only one line of a Kārikā[3] and a brief discussion on that line. After the discussion of Nāṭikā the ND points out that Prakaraṇī is also just like Nāṭikā except that the hero is from Prakaraṇa. Prakaraṇī has the same number of Acts, Sandhis etc., as Nāṭikā. But the hero is a merchant or a Brahmin or a minister as in Prakaraṇa. The heroine should be appropriate to the caste and creed. Fruit should be attainment of wealth and woman as a merchant or a Brahmin has little interest in obtaining and conquering kingdoms which will be the aim if the hero were a King as in Nāṭikā[4].

Kaiśikī should dominate here as in Nāṭaka. Thus here too there is a combination of characteristics of both Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa.

Etymologically Prakaraṇī is so called because the plot is wholly created i.e. invented here[5]. The suffix 'Kap' when attached to Prakaraṇī gives Prakaraṇikā.

Both Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī are derived from the mixture of Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa, the two main Rūpakas. The ND points out that there can be several such types by the admixture of two, three or more of the main Rūpakas but they are not well-known and not interesting.

Critical Remarks :

The above discussion clearly suggests that the authors of the ND are fully aware of this derivative nature of both, Nāṭikā[6] and Prakaraṇī. The ND actually considers them as derived from the mixture of the two main types of drama. The names Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī too attest to their derivative nature from the full-fledged dramas Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa respectively. Though the word Nāṭī occurs in the NS which points to its

1 RS III, 220-223.
2. SD VI, 272.
3. ND II, 73b.
4. Cf. Strī-mahī-phalā......ND II, 5.
5 Prakarṣeṇa kriyate kalpyate asyām arthaḥ iti......ND, p. 122.
6. Dr. A. N. Upadhye opines that Nāṭikā is derived from Saṭṭaka. Saṭṭaka on account of its graceful elements of dance, love-intrigue, marvelous sentiment, etc., attracted the attention of the cultured classes (and court circles) and it was made to conform to the orthodox canons of Nāṭaka, and the result of such an effort was the Nāṭikā. "Thus Nāṭikā is an orthodox edition of the popular Saṭṭaka." - Candralekhā (Introduction) p. 31.

early origin still its dependence on Nāṭaka is obvious from the very name which appears as a dimunitive of Nāṭaka, having its plot, hero, heroine, etc., on the basis of Nāṭaka.

From the above discussion it is evident that Nāṭikā as a form of drama was as old as the NS of Bharata but at the same time it was not recognized as an independent form of drama probably because it was recognized as a variation of Nāṭaka[1] and that is why the NS (and the DR too follows) treats of it under Nāṭaka.

But this derivative nature should not lead us to the undervaluation of the Nāṭikā. We are not so much concerned with the origin of a particular type of drama as with the actual type. In that case all the types of plays can be said to have originated from one type. D. R. Mankad on the same line propounds that Bhāṇa is the origin of all the ten types of plays[2]. There is some similarity of theme, characters, sentiments etc., between one of the ten types of plays and the rest. Hence it is not improbable that one might have originated from the other.

Nāṭikā is included by some of the theorists like Viśvanātha in Uparūpakas. They are, however, not quite justified. If we scrutinize the general nature of all the Uparūpakas we find that it differs considerably from that of the Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇikā. Uparūpaka is the term first used by Viśvanātha. Originally they were known as Geya rūpakas.

If we have a glance at the Nāṭikās that are available to us such as the RTN, the Priyadarśikā and others we find that there is nothing in them which should deprive them of the honour of being recognized as a Rūpaka. From the point of view of the plot, characters, dialogues, etc., they can be well compared with any of the other types of Rūpakas.

The definition of Nāṭikās will show that it is not simply a dimunitive form of Nāṭaka. Even though the hero in the Nāṭikā is a well-known king as in a Nāṭaka, still however, the handling of the matter (i.e. the plot) is mainly based on the poet's imagination, while in Nāṭaka the theme is purely historical or legendary. Nāṭaka can have Vīra also as its dominant sentiment. Nāṭikā, on the contrary, is dominated by Śṛṅgāra only. Preponderance of women characters, exhuberance of Kaiśikī Vṛtti, along with the total absence of Avamarśa Saṁdhi according to some[3], are some of the further features which go to distinguish it from Nāṭaka. Thus it will not be quite correct to say that Nāṭikā is simply a Nāṭaka in miniature.

1. Vide RS, III, 218.
2. Vide 'The types of Sanskrit Drama', pp. 77-87, on "Evolution of Rūpakas".
3. Vide NLR, p. 114.

The SD puts Nāṭikā (and Prakaraṇikā too) under the Uparūpakas but does not explain the grounds for doing so. Preponderance of music should not lead us to put it under the minor Rūpakas especially when it includes all other elements which are essential for a Rūpaka. Nāṭikā is certainly not of the nature of Rāsaka or Hallīsaka.

On the other hand, music has a very important place in drama. A poet like Kālidāsa has used the element of music in all his plays. In his Māl. he arranges a charming dance-performance by the heroine. In the Śākuntala the song has been introduced twice very effectively. In the Vikramorvaśīya the major part of Act IV is full of song and music.

The theorists who include it amongst the Uparūpakas-minor plays—on the basis of the length or the number of acts are equally unjustified as Nāṭikā (as well as Prakaraṇikā) consists of four Acts while not less than fifty percent of the ten types of the so called 'major' Rūpakas are simply one-act plays.

The above arguments will justify the stand of the ND when it follows the theorists like Hemacandra and Bhoja who especially mention Nāṭikā as one of the principal Rūpakas. The other works like the DR and the NLR follow Bharata in treating it along with Rūpakas but not mentioning it independently among them.

Similar is the case with the Prakaraṇikā also. The early origin of Prakaraṇikā is vaguely suggested by the reference of the NS to two types of Nāṭī[1]. Abhinava refers to the view of 'some' who held that Prakaraṇikā was also found with a merchant, a minister, etc. as the hero and dominated by Kaiśikī Vṛtti (II, p. 436). Dhanika also quotes the above reference from Bharata and refers to the view of those who regard Prakaraṇikā also as a type of drama and refutes it on the ground that Bharata has not mentioned or defined it and that it is not different from Prakarana as the plot, the hero and the sentiment of Prakaraṇikā are not essentially different from those of Prakaraṇa[2].

The ND seems to be the first to discuss the nature and characteristics of Prakaraṇī in detail. The SD mentions it as an Uparūpaka[3] but does not mention any illustration of the type.

The above discussion suggests that there was a group of theorists even in early days, who recognised Prakaraṇikā as a type of drama.

---

1. Prakhyātas tvitaro vā nāṭīsaṁjñāśrite kāvye – NS XVIII, 57.
2. Prakaraṇikām api manyante. Tad asat. Uddeśalakṣaṇayor anabhidhānāt. Vasturasanāyakānāṁ prakaraṇābhedāt prakaraṇikāyāḥ. DR, p. 72
3. "Prakaraṇī is Nāṭikā only with a merchant etc. as the hero. The heroine also is of the family which is on par with that of the hero." —SD VI. 306.

But it appears that this type of drama could not obtain so wide popularity as Nāṭikā did. The reason possibly seems to be that the Hindoo dramatists probably believed that in order that a work may be everlasting, its hero and its subject-matter must be dignified. And that is why great Sanskrit dramatists like Kālidāsa and others have selected the celebrated kings usually from the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata as the heroes of their plays. It is therefore that we find a very insignificant number of Prakaraṇas (whose hero is a middle-class man), as compared to a very vast number of Nāṭakas. Most of the dramatists of high order have exhibited their art in this variety (Nāṭaka) of drama[1]. Thus when we find that even Prakaraṇas are few and far between the scarcity of Prakaraṇīs can very well be understood.[2]

Moreover, theoretically it is quite possible to have this variety viz., Prakaraṇī from Prakaraṇa. Prakaraṇa. as we know, is a gigentic play usually in ten Acts (cf. MṚC of Śūdraka and Mālatīmādhava of Bhavabhūti). So a miniature form of this voluminous play was necessary and this should have given birth to this new type with only four Acts.[3]

Some of the theorists have ignored this type of drama probably because they did not have a concrete illustration of this type before them[4].

It is, however, possible to find an illustration of this type in the Daridracārudatta of Bhāsa (discovered by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, Trivendrum). It is exactly in four acts and satisfies all the requirements of a Prakaraṇī. That we do not find the mention of this work as a play of this type may probably be due to the fact that Bhāsa's plays were not easily available to the later theorists, except the Svapnavāsavadatta which alone could stand the test of time[5]. Those who recognize this type must

1. A similar view is expressed by Dr. Raghavan when he observes that "The prevailing Indian attitude being however more attuned to the epic and the heroic the Prakaraṇa did not keep the attention of literary men in a pronounced manner". Dr. V. Raghavan further remarks......"this led to a neglect of the type, not only on the production side, but also on the side even of preserving the manuscripts of the specimens produced". The social play in Sanskrit, p. 5.
2. That the Prakaraṇī could not win wide popularity or prominence may also be inferred from Bharata's vague remark that out of the two types af Nāṭis one was eminent (प्रख्यात) and the other was not. (NS (KM) XVIII, 109)
3. Apart from the number of Acts the ND points out another distinguishing feature of Prakaraṇikā. In Prakaraṇikā there should be abundance of Kaiśikī while in Prakaraṇa Kaiśikī should be scarce.
4. The SD admits this difficulty when it remarks that the illustration is to be searched. (SD, p. 223).
5. Cf. Rājaśekhara: "The critics threw the plays of Bhāsa into fire in order to test their worth. But the fire could not burn the Svapnavāsavadatta". Vākpatirāja also refers to him as "Jvalanamitra Bhāsa". Vide Gauḍavaho, verse 800. (p. 221.)

have this or some similar plays in view.[1] Dr. Keith, therefore, is not perfectly justified when he says that "It (Prakaraṇikā) is due merely to false desire for a symmetry".[2] Prof. D. R. Mankad also remarks: "Prakaraṇī seems to have enjoyed quite a temporary existence, there being found almost no example of this type. And the very fact that it has been recognised by such a late work as ND and no earlier work, goes to prove that it was a futile attempt on the part of the later theorists to create a new type, perhaps on the analogy of Nāṭikā"[3]. But here the statement of Dhanika quoted earlier on p. 90(F. N. 2), which clearly implies that there were theorists, even before Dhanika, who recognized Prakaraṇikā as a type of Rūpaka, taking a clue probably from Bharata's dubious remark, viz., Nāṭīsaṁjñāśrite Kāvye, seems to have escaped the notice of Prof. Mankad.

It appears that Nāṭikā had started developing as an independent form of drama ever since the times of Bharata but was generally included in the Nāṭaka. Bhoja seems to be the first to grant it the position of one of the principal Rūpakas. Prakaraṇikā, on the other hand, could not be so popular as the Nāṭikā and so the old theorists like Dhanika did not recognize it. The ND seems to be the earliest among the extant works on dramaturgy to give the Prakaraṇikā also the status of a Rūpaka. The authors of the ND deserve appreciation for raising these two types which even though derived from the two of the full-fledged dramas developed their individual characteristics, to the status of principal Rūpakas. Especially the attempt of our authors to include Prakaraṇikā in the principal Rūpakas is unique. Here they have ignored the view of even Hemacandra, their preceptor, who does not mention this type at all.

4. VYĀYOGA :

The remaining eight of the Rūpakas beginning with Vyāyoga differ from the earlier four which have all the five Avasthās and Sandhis. While the Vyāyoga and the succeeding seven types do not have all of the five Avasthās, Sandhis, etc., but are deficient in one or more. The authors of the ND start with Vyāyoga because it has a human being as the hero[4].

1. Rāmacandra and Gunacandra remark that there can be many varieties of Rūpakas by combining the characteristics of two or more Rūpakas but they are not mentioned as they are not to be found and are not interesting (p. 108) suggesting thereby that these two, viz., Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī are actually found and are also interesting.
2. Sanskrit Drama, p. 350.
3. The Types of Sanskrit Drama, p. 94.
4. Manuṣyanāyakapratyāsattyā prathamaṁ vyāyogaṁ lakṣayati — ND, p. 123.

Vyāyoga is a one-act play and the action extends not over a day. There are only three Sandhis excluding Garbha and Avamarśa[1]. The main sentiment being Vīra the hero should be full of fury and heroism. He cannot brooke delay, and through fear of obstacles his efforts are vehement immediately after the stage of Ārambha and at once he runs towards Phalāgama only. The same is the case with the hero of Ihāmṛga too. The heroes of Ḍima and Samavakāra have the state of Prāptyāśā as their aspirations are many but do not have Vimarśa as they do not suspect frustration. Bhāṇa, Prahasana, Utsṛṣṭikāṅka and Vīthī have only two stages beginning and close specially because they treat of very limited plot. The heroes of Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa (as well as Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇikā) have to pass through all the stages as they are capable of enduring, as they take every step after proper consideration, as they have to remove the impediments etc, as their task is beneficial and embodies manifold results. So Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa have all the five Sandhis.

Here also when the two Sandhis Garbha and Avamarśa are absent the corresponding Avasthās, viz., Prāptyāśā and Niyatāpti too are absent.

In Vyāyoga, there is a battle but not for obtaining a woman, e. g, in the Jāmadagnyajaya the fight between Paraśurāma and Sahasrārjuna is shown but not for a woman. There should be combats, competition and rivalry. All these inflame Vīra. It has no Kaiśikī Vṛtti and has less of women characters and more of males.

The plot is well-known.

The principal sentiments are Vīra and Raudra and so even prose as well as verse is full of Ojas.

The hero cannot be divine. He must be a commander-in-chief or a minister.

It has no heroine, the sentiment being heroic.

The ND also gives an etymology of the word Vyāyoga which is derived from Vi + Ā + √Yuj, the prefix 'Vi' signifies speciality (Viśeṣeṇa), 'Ā' signifies "on all sides" (Samantāt). It is so called as here vigorous fights take place on all sides.

The ND mentions the view of 'some' who hold that the Vyāyoga has twelve heroes[2]. The ND here practically repeats what the NS has already stated.

---

1. The NS does not mention this but the DR does. Hīno garbhavimarśābhyāṁ (III, 61). NLR says that there should be only two Sandhis – Mukha and Nirvahaṇa (p. 116).
2. Cf. DR. – Vyāyogo bahubhir naraiḥ : III, 62; also NS XVIII, 41.

The illustration of Vyāyoga given by the ND is the Jāmadagnyajaya where the fight between Paraśurāma and Sahasrārjuna is described and ultimately the former kills the latter[1].

Remarks :

The ND at the outset points out why it treats of Vyāyoga first, the reason being that the hero here is human. It is really difficult to grasp what the ND means here. No work on dramaturgy mentions Vyāyoga immediately after Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa but the ND does so and points out that this early mention is deliberate because of the reason given above. Do the authors of the ND mean to say that in other types of drama the hero is not a human being ?

About the hero of the Vyāyoga, Dr. Keith remarks that he should be "a god or royal sage but Dhanañjaya allows a man ".[2] But it should be noted here that it is not Dhanañjaya alone who allows a man as the hero. The ND asserts that the hero must be a man[3]. Even the NS reads that 'the hero should not be divine'[4]. But here Dr. Keith seems to have followed another reading which is just the opposite[5].

The NLR adds that its hero should be well-known. 'The act should not describe love in union or it may describe the wedding with a hermit-girl....It should not have much of Tragic (Karuṇa) or Love (Śṛṅgāra)'[6].

It appears that among the one-act plays in Sanskrit this type had been fairly popular with the dramatists and the cultured audience, as we find it to have been attempted by such an old and reputed dramatist as Bhāsa whose Madhyamavyāyoga[7], Ūrubhanga etc., are so well-known and the later playwrights also did try it occasionally

5. SAMAVAKĀRA :

Next to Vyāyoga comes Samavakāra. The ND begins with the etymological explanation. Samavakāra is so called because it is created (Kriyate) by means of attaining threefold end, either combined (Saṁgata)

1. The same illustration is found in the DR, p. 7.
2. Sanskrit Drama, p. 347.
3. BP opines that heroes must be well-known kings or gods of Dhirodātta nature (p 248).
4. Na ca divyanāyakakṛtaḥ—NS (GOS) XVIII, 92.
5. Sa ca divyamānuṣa...etc. NS (GOS) VOL II, p. 445 F. N.
6. NLR, pp. 115-6.
7. Prof. D. R. Mankad does not recognize the Madhyama as a Vyāyoga as there is a meeting with the heroine but puts it under Īhāmṛga type but here he seems to have ignored the statement of Bharata that in Īhāmṛga, as the very name suggests, the fight should take place for the sake of a divine lady (NS (GOS) XVIII, 78), while it is not the case in the Madhyama.

or individually (Avakīrṇa)[1]. The root is $\sqrt{Kṛ}$ prefixed by Saṁ+Ava. The etymology is correct but the interpretation though ingenius is far from being acceptable. The DR interprets it as 'Samavakīryante Arthāḥ Yasmin'[2]. Abhinava gives a similar etymology 'Saṁbaddhaḥ Avakīrṇaśca Yatrārthaḥ Samavakāraḥ'[3]. The word may also be explained thus: it is so called because here the scattered purposes of the twelve heroes are combined (Saṁ)[4].

The plot is well-known. It has four Śandhis excluding Vimarśa.

Hero :- The hero is either a god or a demon[5]. The ND here remarks that the gods are called Dhīroddhata as compared to human beings. If compared to the beings of their own class they should be Dhīrodātta.

There are twelve heroes. These twelve heroes may be in each of the three Acts[6] or each Act may have a group of four viz., the hero, the hero's rival (Pratināyaka) and a helpmate to each. If the number is more or less under certain circumstances it is no fault. The fruits of all these twelve heroes should be differently stated, e. g., in the Payodhimathana Viṣṇu and others get Lakṣmī, and others individually. Thus even the helpers such as Sugrīva and others are termed heroes.

The chief sentiments are Vīra and Raudra. Even though the Samavakāra is supposed to delineate three-fold Śṛṅgāra the principal sentiments should not be other than Vīra and Raudra. Since the gods and demons are of haughty and arrogant nature, Śṛṅgāra can come only subordinately.

There are three Acts and three tppes of Śṛṅgāra. Each of the three Acts is characterised by all the three Śṛṅgāras and not that each Act will have only one type of Śṛṅgāra with the result that each Act would have a different type of Śṛṅgāra. The dramatist should also introduce Vīthyaṅgas such as Vyāhāra, etc.

There should be three Acts. The duration of its three Acts should be six Muhūrtas or twelve Ghaṭikās, two Muhūrtas or four Ghaṭikās, and one Muhūrta or two Ghaṭikās respectively. Thus the total time for the whole play should be nine Muhūrtas or eighteen Ghaṭikās, i. e. about seven hours and twelve minutes[7].

1. Cf. ND, p. 124.
2. Cf. DR, p. 75.
3. Cf. Abhi. II, p. 438.
4. ND clearly states that the purposes of the heroes are different.
5. Viśvanātha differs. He allows gods and men. Cf. SD VI, 235
6. Cf. NS (GOS) Vol. II, p. 438.
7. ND, pp. 124-125. Here the ND has followed the NS. Cf. NS (KM) XVIII, 116-120.

Here the ND refers to another view of some under the name 'Eke' who ordain quite double the duration given above for each of the three Acts.[1] The view obviously refers to the DR.

The NS gives the precise duration of three Acts as twelve, four and two Nāḍikās respectively[2]. Bharata further goes to explain what the word Nāḍī or Nāḍikā means. A Nāḍī is the same as Nāḍikā and is equal to one half of a Muhūrta. Now one Muhūrta is equal to two Ghaṭikās and so a Nāḍī will be equal to a Ghaṭikā. And this is exactly what the ND has stated. The ND instead of giving the time in Nāḍīs prefers a simpler and current word Muhūrta following the instruction of the NS, viz, 1 Nāḍī = $\frac{1}{2}$ Muhūrta. Thus the first Act will be equal to 6 Muhūrtas (= 12 Nāḍīs of the NS).

The DR follows the NS when it points out the time just as the NS has done in the measurement of Nāḍikā which it calls Nālikā. It states that the First Act should be of 12 Nālikās[3] and the rest of 4 and 2 Nālikās respectively but adds that one Nālikā is equal to two Ghaṭikās[4]. This changes the entire length of time. Now 12 Nālikās of the DR will mean, not 6 Muhūrtas (as according to the NS or the ND) but 12 Muhūrtas or 24 Ghaṭikās; thus the time becomes actually double the one stated in the NS or the ND. Similarly the rest of the two Acts will also have double the time. Thus the total time for performing the whole play will be 18 Nālikās i.e. 36 Ghaṭikās i.e. 14 hours and 24 minutes.

The explanation of the DR will mean that the drama will continue for 14 hours e. g. if it starts by eight o'clock at night it will continue for the whole night and upto ten o'clock of the next day morning. This is quite improbable if not absurd. One can easily comprehend how boring it would be to the audience when a drama lasts so long. Over and above the fact that it will be a waking for the whole night, it will engage the whole of the morning and thus greatly disturb the usual routine, which a drama is not supposed to do under any circumstance (Āvaśyakāvirodhena)[5].

Thus the explanation of the ND is more reasonable. We know that in ancient times the performance of dramas often went on past midnight. A dramatic performance which lasts for six to seven hours, though it may sound pretty lengthy to us, was not unusual in old days.

The dictionary of V. S. Apte interprets Nālikā as equal to 24 minutes or one Ghaṭikā. Thus the DR's interpretation of Nālikā = 48 minutes

1. Cf. Eke tu pratyaṅkaṁ yathoditadviguṇaṁ kālamānam āhuḥ-ND, p. 125.
2. NS XVIII, 64-66.
3. DR III, 65 cd.
4. Nālikā ghaṭikādvayaṁ - DR III, 66b.
5. Vide NS (KM) XVIII, 24-25.

is rather arbitrary and not supported by any source nor by reason or logic.

Every Act is complete in itself. The object, the fruit and the means of attaining it with regard to one Act have no concern with those of the other Acts. Thus all Acts stand unconnected and independent of one another so far as their own objects are concerned. They are connected at the end in the accomplishment of the ultimate fruit of the whole play. Thus the development of the plot is rather singular and unique. Immediately after the end of Āmukha or Prastāvanā, the Bīja suggesting the object or fruit of all the three Acts must be first introduced. Then the first two Acts must be shown as unconnected, each accomplishing its own personal end and leaving aside the main object of the play[1]. Then the third Act should be composed in such a way that it interlinks all the three Acts with a common motive, which were otherwise unconnected being concerned with the fulfilment of their own private motives. Since the Acts are not mutually connected[2] Bindu is not to be employed. Sandhis are four excepting Vimarśa The first Act will have two Sandhis viz., Mukha and Pratimukha. The second Act will have Garbha and the third Act will have Nirvahaṇa.

There are three types of Śṛṅgāra, Kapaṭa (fraud), and Vidrava (retreat or running away) each.

The three types of love (Śṛṅgāra) are as under :

(i) Having 'Dharma' or religion as the fruit and cause e. g., Śṛṅgāra, arising out of the union with one's own wife, has for its fruit religion viz., abstinence from another's wife and which has religion i. e. religious performances as its cause (Hetu) such as giving alms etc., which also may result in the attainment of a lady and the like.

(ii) Having love (Kāma) as the fruit and cause. Both Kāma and Śṛṅgāra mean love or pleasures of love. Kāma in the form of sexual pleasures may be recognized as the fruit of Śṛṅgāra and Kāma in the form of man and woman who represent love is the cause of Śṛṅgāra in the form of sexual pleasures. When this Kāma-Śṛṅgāra is to be depicted, the heroine should be another's wife (or a maiden, and not one's own wife nor a harlot) as Ahalyā in Indra's case. If the heroine is one's own lawfully married wife, the love depicted ceases to be purely sexual but becomes a part of religious duty also.

1. ND, p. 125. Avāntaravākyārthena parasparavicchinnam āyojyaṁ.

2. The point has been referred to earlier also by the ND, when it denies Viṣkambhaka and Praveśaka for Samavakāra as its Acts are not interrelated (p. 39).

(iii) Having material gain (Artha) as the fruit and cause. Material gain would mean kingdom, gold, wealth, grains, clothes, etc. The love between prostitutes and wealthy people has wealth for its fruit, as the prostitutes show love for any ordinary man and as a result get money. In the same way the cause of love is also money. The love with harlots is based on money.

'Kapaṭa' or fraud or cheating is defined by the ND as a contrivance which is based on falsehood but appears to be true. It is of three types:

(i) Cheating a person who is guilty.

(ii) Cheating a person who is not guilty and as a result of intentional mischief by the fraudulent person.

(iii) The deceit or fraud which is just accidental (by Kākatālīya Nyāya as the ND puts it). The person deceived is not guilty nor has the deceiver intended it. It is a mischief of fate.

Vidrava signifies 'tumult'[1]. The ND explains it as Anartha i. e. calamity. It too is of three types:

(i) Caused by animate entities such as elephants, etc.

(ii) Caused by inanimate entities such as weapons, etc.

(iii) Caused by animate as well as inanimate objects e. g. siege to a town where both elephants and weapons are at work.

Now the three types of Love, fraud and calamity are to be depicted in the three Acts one after the other separately.

Metres should be lengthy such as Sragdharā, Śārdūlavikrīdita etc., and not such simple ones such as Gāyatrī and others[2]. But the ND refers to the view of 'some' who allow Gāyatrī and other Vedic metres as well as other Viṣama and Ardhasama metres.

Here the ND differs from Bharata (and Abhinava) who does allow Vedic metres such as Gāyatrī, Uṣṇik and others[3]. Abhinava refers to the view of Udbhaṭa who opines that only lengthy metres such as Sragdharā should be employed and not those which consist of lesser

---

1. The ND gives the etymological meaning of the word viz. Vidravanti trasyanti janā asmād iti Vidravo 'narthaḥ. p. 126.

2. The propriety of the above statement can easily be perceived. As the dominant sentiment is Vira or/and Raudra, lengthy metres which provoke the heroic or the furious sentiment should be employed.

3. Cf. NS (GOS) XVIII, 76 and Abhinava's commentary over it (p. 441).

number of syllables (like Gāyatrī and others). The DR is silent on this point. The BP[1] and the SD[2] follow the NS.

The use of Vedic metres in the Samavakāra might be to create an air of divinity[3] as the characters are all divine. This may also suggest that in the early times the practice of employing Vedic metres was in vogue which may have been discontinued in later times.

The ND concludes the discussion by pointing out that a play of this sort which is full of humorous love, fraud, excitement, magic, fights between gods and demons which is carried on by supernatural powers, being far from realism is meant for entertaining the common 'masses' by arousing their sense of curiosity, suggesting thereby that such a type of drama is not meant for the cultured strata of society.

6. BHĀṆA :

Etymology:—Bhāṇa is derived from the root √Bhaṇ (to speak) and is so called as the hero narrates his own or another's adventures by resorting to speaking in the air[4].

Sentiment: Since the story pertains chiefly to one's heroic exploits and good fortune, the principal sentiments are Śṛṅgāra and Vīra. Hāsya can be introduced in a subordinate manner.

Sandhis :—There must be two Sandhis only - Mukha and Nirvahaṇa - the first and the last.

The action extends over a day only and so it has only one Act.

Ten elements of Lāsya are to be introduced here. They are:

(1) Geyapada, (2) Sthitapāthya, (3) Āsīna, (4) Puṣpagaṇḍikā, (5) Pracchedaka, (6) Trigūḍha, (7) Saindhavākhya, (8) Dvigūḍhaka, (9) Uttamottamaka and (10) Uktapratyukta[5].

1. BP, p. 250 verbally follows the NS.
2. SD VI, 237.
3. Cf. Abhijñānaśākuntala IV, 10 where the blessing is showered by Kaṇva in Vedic Triṣṭubh metre.
4. Cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 449 Also cf. DR (Avaloka)-Bhāratīvṛttipradhānatvāt bhāṇaḥ - p. 73.
5. This seems to have been borrowed from Bharata. The NS enumerates the ten Lāsyāṅgas and defines them. The DR simply mentions them. The BP adds Bhāvita to the above list and makes the total number eleven (pp. 245-46).

Dr. M. Ghosh interprets the word Lāsyāṅga as a one-act play which requires Lāsya or a gentle form of dance for its representation. The term is explained as Lāsyaṁ aṅgaṁ yasya saḥ' (that which has Lāsya as its principal element). But this interpretation though ingenious seems to be far-fetched.

This topic has been elaborately discussed by Dr. Raghavan in his paper on Lāsyāṅgas and Bhāṇa.

Generally Bhāṇa is for the recreation of the common people as it deals with the life of Viṭas, rogues, harlots, etc.

Now the ND discusses the nature of Bhāṇa which is highly peculiar. The hero or the person who comes on the stage to narrate his life or that of others is a Viṭa (libertine or paramour of a harlot) or a rogue, or a thief or a gambler. He describes the incidents of his own life or of a harlot, or of a woman of low character.

The main Vṛtti here is Bhāratī i. e verbal. Though Vīra and Śṛṅgāra are principal sentiments, as the character resorts to Ākāśokti, the verbal gesticulation (Vācika Abhinaya and not others) predominates; therefore Sātvatī or Kaiśikī come only subordinately[1]. Here the story mainly concerns as to how a Viṭa deceives others, thereby warning the audience against such pitfalls.

Here another view is mentioned with the word 'Kecit' according to which the plot should be imaginary and the hero should be a Viṭa only. The view refers to the DR.

Critical Remarks :

The DR ordains that the hero should be a Viṭa who narrates the the life of a rogue or a thief which he himself or some body else might have experienced.[2] The DR also points out that the subject-matter is invented by the poet[3]. The apparent contradiction in the statements of the DR when it is stated on one side that Bhāṇa delineates the actual experiences of a person and on the other that the story is imaginary, can be resolved easily. What the DR means is that the plot here is neither historical nor legendary. It is imaginary but is represented as if it were one's personal experience.

Even though the story described may be related to some actual incident which one might have come across in life, it should be described on the basis of one's imagination only. Because here the object is not to give the factual account of an experience which is likely to be boring and insipid. This is true not only of Bhāṇa but of other forms of drama also. Around the nucleus of certain incidents or episodes whose root may be in history or in day-to-day life, the poet erects the artistic structure by means of his creative imagination and poetic talents.

---

1. Kohala seems to differ here. He believes that the Vṛtti here is Kaiśikī as the chief sentiments are Śṛṅgāra, Vīra and Karuṇa. But Abhinava vehemently opposes this view. Cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 452.

2. DR III, 49.

3. DR III, 51.

Thus Bhāṇa is a monologue in one Act in which the performer narrates dramatically a variety of occurrences. "Love, war, fraud, intrigue and imposition are appropriate topics and the narrator may enliven his recitation by supposititous dialogue with an imaginary interlocutor"[1]. Prof. Wilson also points out that it should begin and end with music and singing.

Among all the Rūpakas Bhāṇa stands out unique in the sense that it is carried on only by one character. The conversational form of drama requires that it should have at least two characters, in the absence of which no dialogue is possible. But peculiar is the state of affairs in Bhāṇa where only one person carries the thread of drama. This would naturally turn into a sort of Kathā or story-telling which is prevalent even at present in villages of India. This peculiar form of Bhāṇa leads Prof. D. R. Mankad to think that Bhāṇa must have been the earliest form of Sanskrit drama[2]. Of course, this one-act play by one character only seems to remind us of some early primal stage in dramatic development[3]. Still it is possible to argue that the representation of sentiments, emotions, situations, etc., by a single person may reveal a high development in dramatics.

The peculiar nature of Bhāṇa clearly suggests, as Prof. A. B. Keith has pointed out, its "popular character and origin."[4] Prof. S. K. De has elaborately discussed this point in his article on "Sanskrit Monologue Play"[5]. From the actual Bhāṇas that are available at present one can easily see that Bhāṇa, like Prahasana, was meant for entertaining the masses and not the intelligentzia or the higher aristrocratic class for whom the refined types of dramas like Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa were primarily written[6]. Thus Bhāṇa does not seem to have enjoyed a dignified status.

7. PRAHASANA :

The chief purpose of Prahasana, the ND states, is to acquaint the common people with the ways of rogues, scoundrels, etc., and thereby make them turn away their faces from them. The plot delineates ridiculous or abhorrent social customs or hypocrisy by falsely showing

1. H. H. Wilson : Dramas, p. 22.
2. Cf. The Types of SK. Drama, p. 78.
3. Also Cf. "We have here a formal version of a primitive mimetic performance" - Sanskrit Drama, p. 348.
4. Sanskrit Drama, p. 348; also Indian Theatre, p. 143.
5. Vide Aspects of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 1-25.
6. Cf. Abhirūpabhūyiṣṭhā pariṣad iyaṁ; also, Ā paritoṣād viduṣāṁ, etc. (1-2).

oneself to be a person of very good character, e.g., the Śākyas condemn the illicit affairs with a woman but not theft.

Vīthyaṅgas should be introduced wherever suitable.

As the very name suggests, the principal sentiment is Hāsya[1].

There are two Sandhis, Mukha and Nirvahaṇa, as in Bhāṇa. It has but one act[2]. The Vṛtti is Bhāratī. In spite of Hāsya being dominant the Vṛtti is not Kaiśikī because Kaiśikī is principally used to depict Śṛṅgāra. But in Prahasana the dominating sentiment is simply Hāsya and there is no Śṛṅgāra which being so refined and elevated a sentiment is not fit to be depicted with reference to such low characters as rogues and scoundrels and Kaiśikī is principally meant for Śṛṅgāra. Consequently Lāsyaṅgas also here are few and far between.

Prahasana is divided into two types: 1) Pure (Śuddha) and 2) Mixed (Saṅkīrṇa or Miśra).

1) *Pure* - Here the characters are despicable such as Śākyas, Bhagavattāpasas i.e. Śaiva ascetics[3] etc, or Brahmins by birth only who are not learned but attain their livelihood on the strength of their birth in respectable families. But the life that is depicted here is completely devoid of shameful or contemptuous vulgar action. The purpose is to create humour only and this variety is therefore full of humorous, witty and ridiculous speeches. Thus the plot being unmixed with harlots, etc., this type of Prahasana is called Pure.

2) The other type (mixed) is so called as it combines in itself the lives of a variety of people. It has a number of attendants, varied costumes, speeches and actions. The characters are arrogant, immodest (Uddhata) and low such as procuresses, rogues, eunuchs, old persons, scoundrels, Brahmins (by birth only), paramours, spies, warriors, etc. having odd dresses, speeches and actions which are contemptuous and ludicrous.

In this type of Prahasana through one character such as a harlot many others are mocked at. Thus the subject here is the life of miscellaneous people, while in Śuddha only one, such as a hypocrite is laughed at.

The ND quotes another view according to which Saṅkīrṇa, is one where the conduct of naturally innocent people and heretics is mocked at[4].

1. Prakarṣeṇa hāsaḥ hasanaṁ vā vartate yasmin tat prahasanaṁ.
2. SD holds that there can also be two acts. VI, 267.
3. The phrase Bhagavattāpasavipräḥ which occurs in the NS is explained by Abhi. as Yativānaprasthagṛhasthāḥ. The word 'Anya' in NS is taken by Abhi. to mean Śākyas and others. The Avaloka on DR refers to Nirgranthas i. e. Jainas along with Śākyas. The authors of the ND are silent on this point.
4. ND p. 129. This view has been referred to by Abhinava as the view of 'some'. Cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 448.

There is still another view which holds that Saṅkīrṇa or mixed type of Prahasana has many Acts.[1]

The object of Prahasana is to make children, ladies and fools who are incapable of appreciating serious plays, take interest in drama, which the poet creates by resorting to cheap humour. For the cultured types of people who can enjoy serious plays, other forms of drama which represent Dharma, Artha, and Kāma are composed. Here in both the types of Prahasana the life of rogues, knaves, paramours, etc., is depicted so that a common man may beware of them.

In short, Prahasana, like Bhāṇa, is a drama for the common masses. Dr. Keith rightly remarks that it has "every sign of popular origin and vogue"[2]. Nāṭaka and similar other types of dramas were written primarily for the higher classes of society, for the assembly of the learned critics without whose approval a drama would stand no where. "It is in such types as Prahasana that the masses would get their familiar figures, the rogue, the scoundrel, the vagabond, the courtesan and such things as love-intrigues, quarrels, fights and violence all in their Prakrit speech and wrapped up in such fun as would split their sides with laughter"[3].

9, ḌIMA :

The word Ḍima or Ḍimba means fight, being derived from the root 'Ḍim' to kill or to injure. The principal sentiment here is fury. It has four Sandhis excepting Vimarśa. The sentiments of Śānta, Śṛṅgāra or Hāsya are excluded. Even Karuṇa cannot be introduced. The characters being divine, the sentiment of pathos and others which are unpleasant cannot have any scope here. The ND rightly justifies this[4]. It has mostly sixteen heroes like gods, demons, Piśācas, Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, Nāgas, etc. These heroes are of the haughty type and exhibit different states (Bhāvas).

The principal sentiment being Raudra there must be such scenes and incidents as may go to heighten the Rasa. Thus falling of a meteor, an earth-quake or thunder-stroke, solar or lunar eclipse, etc., should be shown. It abounds in combats and magic.

There are four Acts and four Sandhis and hence the action should not spread over more than four days.

The purpose of this type of play is to entertain the votaries of gods and so there must be a god as the hero or the plot should be

---

1. This view is also mentioned by Abhi. (Vol II. p 449).
2. Sanskrit Drama, p. 348.
3. Preface to Mṛcchakaṭika, p. 5.
4. Cf. ND, p. 129-130.

concerning divinity just as we find in Samavakāra and Īhāmṛga. The plot is renowned, states the NS[1].

Etymology - The ND derives the word from the root 'Ḍim' to kill or to injure (Saṁghāta). Here the ND seems to have followed Dhanika who also derives the word from the same root[2]. Abhinava remarks that Ḍima, Ḍiṁba and Vidrava are all synonyms (meaning 'riot') and Ḍima is so called because it includes riots, fights, etc.[3] Abhinava refers to *some* who give another etymology of the word. It is so called because it abounds in haughty persons (Ḍī = one who flies i.e. moves vigorously)[4].

Dr. Keith points out that "the origin of the name is unknown for no root 'ḍim', (to wound) is found in the language, though Dhanika asserts its existence". But here Keith does not seem to be justified as not only Dhanika but Rāmacandra and Gunacandra also assert the existence of such a root. Moreover, the root Ḍim (Ḍemati) "to hurt, to injure" is found in the dictionary also[5]. This shows that the root 'Ḍim' did exist in language from which the noun 'Ḍima' has been derived.

10. UTSṚṢṬIKĀṆKA :

This is so called because it is marked (Ankita) by sorrowful ladies (whose lives are inclined to depart)[6]. Here the hero is a human being and not divine as the drama is dominated by pathos. The plot which mainly deals with fighting may be well-known or imaginary. Like Bhāṇa it should have two Sandhis viz., Mukha and Nirvahaṇa. The principal Vṛtti is Bhāratī, as the play mainly consists of lamentations of women. It abounds in mere verbal fight amongst arrogant heroes and so there is no Raudra. The speeches should be such as may create despondency in the heart of the audience. Males are to be depicted as having retired from fight, etc. The agitating actions such as falling on the ground, whirling round, beating of breasts or head, plucking one's hair, etc., ought to be represented. Here the women only should weep and not men, as it is to be made known that fortune favours those firm persons who remain unagitated even at the time of calamities.

It should have only one Act as the action must be over in one day.

---

1. NS (GOS) XVIII, 84.
2. Vide DR : (Avaloka) - Ḍima Saṁghāte - p. 74.
3. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 443; also Cf. KS, p. 440.
4. Abhi. II, pp. 443-4.
5. Vide V. S. Apte's Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary.
6. Vide ND, p. 130.

This piece is also known as Aṅka (in short) but it is called Utsṛṣṭikāṅka in order to distinguish it from an act (Aṅka) of the normal drama. The ND quotes the Śarmiṣṭhāyayāti as an example of this type.

11. ĪHĀMṚGA :

Here there is an effort or desire (Īhā) to procure a lady which is difficult to obtain 'as a gazzle (Mṛga).'[1] It has all Vīthyaṅgas. The hero is divine. The human characters are proud and arrogant. It comprises of one act or four acts. The plot may be partly derived from legends and partly from the poet's imagination. The plot consists of fighting in order to procure a lady. If there is one act only the plot should be such as it refers to the incidents which have taken place on the same day. If it has four acts, its action should not spread over more than four days. The ND makes a note that all the four acts should be intimately co-related with one another and should not be detached like those of Samavakāra. Here there is a war for a celestial lady. The rival-hero (Prati-nāyaka) forcibly abducts her and the result is a combat between the hero and his rival. It should be replete with rashness, competitions and calamities. But all these centre around a woman or may have some other purpose. Under some pretext such as fleeing away or the like the fighting should be avoided when the man is on the point of being slain or killed. Not only that the killing is not to be staged, but it is not to be suggested even from behind the curtain. The sentiments are vigorous such as Vīra, Raudra, etc. Sandhis are three excepting Garbha and Avamarśa. Vṛttis can be any of the four excepting Kaiśikī and there can be Ratyābhāsa too as the love of the villain is depicted with reference to a lady who does not love him. The NS wants that the hero should be divine but the DR states that he may be divine or human. Forbidding of Vadha is in accordance with the dramatic conventions established by Bharata. The SD gives Kusumasekharavijaya as an example of this type.

12. VĪTHĪ :

Vīthī is treated the last of all the 12 types of plays. The heroes can be of all types Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama. There may be all types of sentiments too such as Love, Humour, etc. Here the ND quotes a verse under the name of Kohala: 'Vīthī is staged by one or two actors and is of three types according as it has Uttama, Madhyama or Adhama type of hero".[2]

1. ND here follows Abhi. II, p. 442; also see DR, p. 76.
2. Vide ND, p. 132.

The ND here criticises the view of Śaṅkuka who does not allow a low type of character as a hero of Vīthī. The argument of the ND is that even then he accepts a low-born hero such as a Viṭa for Prahasana and Bhāṇa which have humour as the principal sentiment. In that case there is no reason why Vīthī which has a certain similarity with Bhāṇa should not have a low-born hero like Viṭa. Śaṅkuka therefore is inconsistent here and so his view is not acceptable.[1]

It is a one-act play and so the action or plot extends over one day only. The number of characters may be one or two. If one character is there, Ākāśabhāṣita may be resorted to.

Sandhis are only two viz. Mukha and Nirvahaṇa. It has thirteen limbs known as Vīthyaṅgas. They can be used in other types of drama also.

Vīthī is full of thousands of Vakroktis (indirect speeches or equivocations). Here the speech dominates and the sentiments of love and humour are merely suggested. So the Vṛtti is not Kaiśikī but Bhāratī.

Critical observations :

" It is a love story carried on in a comic dialogue, consisting of equivoque, evasion, enigma, quibble, jest, repartee, wilful misconstruction and misapplication, ironical praise, extravagant endearment and jocose abuse."[2]

The NS, the DR, the ND, etc., admit of one or two characters. If it has only one character it will be a sort of monologue very much similar to Bhāṇa. D. R. Mankad in his " The Types of Sanskrit Drama " tries to bring out the remarkable similarity between the two, one being a mere variant of the other, and thereby concludes that Vīthī has evolved from Bhāṇa[3]. The points of similarity are not far to see. Both are one-act plays, having Love as the principal sentiment and are accompanied by Lāsyāṅgas. The difference is that in Vīthī the coarser element of Bhāṇa is dropped. Śaṅkuka does not allow even a low-born character as the hero. Here in Vīthī the dialogues are more witty. The speeches are indirect, evasive, interesting and intelligent. Thus the drama rises in its literary qualities, does not remain simply as a repartee for the unintelligent masses but becomes a feast for the learned few also. This nature of Vīthī is brought out by its very name. The ND gives the etymology as - " Vīthī is so called as it adopts the path of Vakrokti like a crooked street not going straight "[4]. The DR too gives a similar explanation, viz., Vīthī is

1. ND, p. 133 lines 1-2.
2. H. H. Wilson : 'Dramas', p. 27.
3. The Types of Sanskrit Drama, pp. 78-79.
4. Vakroktimārgeṇa gamanāt vīthīva vīthī - ND, p. 132.

like a Vīthī i.e. a street as it has a series of subdivisions. Dr. Keith remarks: "It is suggested that the several sentiments are gathered into it as into a garland"[1].

According to the DR the principal sentiment to be suggested is Śṛṅgāra and Vṛtti is Kaiśikī. The ND on the other hand takes the same point into account and points out that Śṛṅgāra is merely to be suggested (as the DR too states) and so Vṛtti is not Kaiśikī but Bhāratī as the charm of Vīthī consists in the Vīthyangas which are all varied types of jocular and witty speeches. The ND here differs from she DR and seems to correct it. The DR specifically points out that Śṛṅgāra is to be suggested only. Moreover, the DR itself has treated the Vīthyaṅgas (which form the quintessence of Vīthī) under the treatment of Bhāratī Vṛtti. Thus Vīthyaṅgas constitute Bhāratī and so Vīthī too is dominated by Bhāratī and not Kaiśikī. It appears that the ND is quite correct and logical here.

General remarks :

We have offered our critical remarks regarding the particular type of the Rūpaka at the end of the discussion on the same. Here are mentioned only a few points in general.

It is clear that the ND recognizes these twelve only as the principal Rūpakas. A question naturally arises as to what the criteria or determinants for the classification of the ten or twelve Rūpakas are.

All these Rūpakas have grown from Vṛtti, says Bharata[2]. He calls Vṛttis the mothers of all poetry (especially drama). Vṛttis, as the theorists have defined, denote action. Thus if we take Vṛtti as the criterion for the classification of Rūpakas, it would mean that the principle governing drama is action[3].

The classification of the Rūpakas, according to the DR, is on the basis of the three things - the plot, the hero and the sentiment[4]. It is the prevalence of one or more of the three that distinguishes one type from the other.

According to the authors of the ND, the only principle underlying all the principal Rūpakas is Rasa[5] (the principle accepted by almost all the theorists after Bharata) as against the Uparūpakas which are not

1. Sanskrit Drama, p. 349.
2. NS (KM) VI, 26.
3. Cf. 'Drama signifies action' En. Bri. VII, p. 39.
4. Vastu netā rasas teṣāṁ bhedakaḥ. DR I, 11.
5. Vide ND, p. 23, verses 3, 5, 6, 7, also Cf. Rasaprāṇo hi nāṭyavidhiḥ - NLV, p. 77.

dominated by Rasa (Apradhânarasa) and other forms of literature which are dominated by descriptions and figures of speech of various kinds.

Dr. V. Raghavan gives a novel type of classification of dramas :- (i) Heroic drama - Nāṭaka and others (ii) Social drama - Prakaraṇa, Prahasana, Bhāṇa and Vīthī[1].

VĪTHYAṄGAS

Vīthyaṅgas which literally mean subdivisions or limbs of Vīthī constitute thirteen in number. They may be enumerated as under :

(1) Vyāhāra (2) Adhibala (3) Gaṇḍa (4) Prapañca (5) Trigata (6) Chala (7) Asatpralāpa (8) Vākkelī (9) Nālikā (10) Mṛdava (11) Udghātyaka (12) Avalagita and (13) Avaspandita.

The ND treats of this topic of Vīthyaṅgas at considerable length supplying each of them with numerous illustrations. At the outset, the ND points out that these Vīthyaṅgas are to be included in Bhāratī style as they are primarily connected with speech, since they represent various types of strikingness of words and sense. The DR, too, treats them as divisions of Bhāratī while discussing the four Vṛttis.

Now let us take up these divisions one by one :

(1) *Vyāhāra* :

Vyāhāra means humorous speech which has some different purpose or which indirectly suggests some future event.

Etymology - It is called Vyāhāra as it carries different senses (Vividha Artha). The root is Vi+A+ √ Hṛ.. Ā+ √ Hṛ means to carry. 'Vi' has the sense of 'Vividha' i. e. various (senses).

In the DR we find 'Hāsyalobhakaraṁ vaca' instead of 'Hāsyaleśagīḥ,' of the ND. 'Leśa' is replaced by 'Lobha'. The SD defines it as "Hāsyakṣobhakaraṁ vacaḥ"[2]. The illustration of the ND is the same as that of the DR and the ND. It is cited from the Māl. (Act II), where the Vidūṣaka makes the heroine tarry on the stage by pointing out that there was a serious flaw in the performance, viz., it did not commence with the adoration of a Brahmin. This causes laughter on the stage[3]. Of course the ND gives the full incident while the DR and the SD give it rather summarily[4].

The ND also adds Bhāvidṛṣṭi i. e. foreshadowing of future events,

1. The Social Play in Sanskrit, p. 1.
2. SD VI, 263.
3. See ND, pp. 133-135.
4. DR, p. 69.

which is not found in the DR. The type is illustrated by the Ratnāvalī (Act II) where the King says: "Today I shall certainly make the queen's face red with anger, gazing upon this garden-creeper, as upon another woman in love, that has instantly displayed a profusion of buds (a powerful longing), has a pale complexion, has its buds opening up (has commenced to yawn) and has been manifesting the disturbance by the ceaseless puffs of wind (by constant heavings of the sighs)"[1].

The definition of the ND very much agrees with that of the NS. The NS too calls it as 'Hāsyaleśārtha'[2].

The NS does not mention Anyārtha and so the object is to suggest a future event only. The illustration of the ND is the same as that of Abhi[3].

This, in fact, is also an illustration of Dramatic Irony or Patākāsthānaka. The only difference is that in Vyāhāra there is essentially a tinge of humour.

The ND gives another view under the name "Anye" according to which Vyāhāra means a humorous speech which describes or speaks something about some object present before one's own eyes;[4] e. g., in the Mṛcchakaṭika the Vidūṣaka's remark with reference to the mother of Vasantasenā that if she dies she will suffice for a hundred jackals and his inquiry whether the door was constructed after placing her in the hall or whether she was anyhow thrust into the hall[5].

Another illustration is from the author's own work Nalavilāsa wherein the Vidūṣaka inquires of the Kāpālikī-named Lambastanī whether she is the same as the mother of his wife, who has bulky breasts and who lives in Pāṭalīputra[6].

In both these illustrations there is humour about a particular object in front and the only purpose is to mock or cut jokes at the particular object. There is no other purport or suggestion of the future in it. (BP follows DR). A similar view is found in the NLR[7]. According to this view, Vyāhāra would mean simple humour usually created by the Vidūṣaka in Sanskrit drama. The humour may be gross or subtle.

(ii) *Adhibala* :

It is a dialogue where a person establishes his own view in course

1. Ratnāvalī II, 4.
2. NS (GOS) XVIII, 125.
3. Abhi. II, p. 458.
4. The view appears to belong to Bhoja. Cf. SP (MS), p. 147.
5. MṚC Act IV, p. 89.
6. NLV, p. 25.
7. Pratyakṣānubhavarūḍhe vyāhāro hāsyaleśakṛt – NLR, p. 124.

of the mutual discussion. The ND explains it etymologically too. 'Adhi' is used in the sense of 'Adhika' i. e. superior; 'Bala' means force or strength. It is so called because here is established the superiority of one's strength (physical or mental).

The ND gives an apt illustration from the KTR (Act I): Here Śūrpaṇakhā disguised as Sītā scolds Lakṣmaṇa for not running to the aid of Rāma. Lakṣmaṇa tries to defend himself by saying that Rāma had kept him there for her sake whereupon Śūrpaṇakhā retorts that it was not so, as she was already protected and that she suspected some evil intention of Lakṣmaṇa therein. Thus the arguments of Lakṣmaṇa are totally refuted and the other view is established.

Another illustration is cited from the author's own work RV where Maya tries to argue that the abduction of Sītā is vigorously condemned by the people of Laṅkā. But Rāvaṇa establishes his own view as correct.

The ND mentions the view of 'some'[1] who hold that Adhibala consists in a dialogue where one vies with the other in establishing one's view. But the ND remarks that there is no remarkable difference in this view. It is contained in the above one.

The two views are very similar, the only minor difference being that the latter emphasises the element of competition which is already implied in the former.

This 'Aṅga' would be highly useful in any type of drama for the employment of forceful dialogue. Here we find interesting arguments by both sides wherein either of the two wins. This has a special importance in the depiction of the heroic sentiment.

This 'Aṅga' can be well compared with the Sandhyaṅga of the same name which occurs when a person deceives the other on account of his or her superiority of intellect. Both are similar so far as the establishment of the superiority of one person over the other is concerned. But while one (Sandhyaṅga) is related to the deception of the inferior by the superior one, the other (Vīthyaṅga) is related to outvying or overpowering the inferior by the superior person.

(iii) *Gaṇḍa* :

When a relevant speech suggests, all of a sudden, some other sense it is called *Gaṇḍa*.[2] The definition is better elucidated in the commentary. The speech is uttered all of a sudden with a view to conveying a

1. This view belongs to none else but the DR. The ND has even retained the wording used by the DR.

2. Cf. ND II, 97ab.

particular idea. But the words or rather speech is arranged in such a way that it conveys indirectly some other sense suggesting some catastrophe to befall in near future. It has some unhappy sense hidden in it and that is why it is called Gaṇḍa which means a boil, or a pimple. Just as a boil has impure or foul blood inside, in the same way Gaṇḍa has some evil import inside it.[1]

A popular and appropriate illustration is found in the UTR of Bhavabhūti :

Rāma-" ..but unbearable is her separation".
Door-keeper - "Lord, (it) has approached".
Rāma - "I say, who?"
Door-keeper - "Durmukha".

Here the door-keeper wants to convey a particular sense, viz., a spy named Durmukha has come. This Durmukha is intended to be the subject of the verb "has approached" (Upasthitaḥ). But if this is connected with the present speech of Rāma it will convey an altogether different sense, viz., his impending separation from Sītā.

The ND quotes another example from Bālikāvañcitaka where Kaṁsa speaks - ...."Who can assail such powerful Kaṁsa?" and the very moment a voice comes from 'behind the scenes'-

"That Kṛṣṇa [(i) black. (ii) Kṛṣṇa, the killer of Kaṁsa] Parapuṣṭa [(i) Cuckoo (ii) brought up by others, viz., Nanda and Yaśodā]... kills and nobody stops."

Here the relevant or intended sense is that referring to the cuckoo but the words have a double meaning and thus when understood in the context with the speech of Kaṁsa it reveals Kṛṣṇa to be the killer of Kaṁsa.

Here the voice 'behind the scenes' when connected with the speech of the character on the stage gives anothor sense which is, of course, not auspicious. This is called "Cūlikā Gaṇḍa".

The first instance that the ND gives from the UTR is also found in the DR[2]. Even the definition given by the ND is substantially the same as that of the DR[3].

Gaṇḍa bears a great resemblance with the fourth variety of Patākāsthānaka discussed by the ND[4], (or the third variety given by

1. The ND has followed here the Abhi. II, p. 458.
2. Vide DR, p. 67.
3. ND p. 137 & DR p. 67.
4. ND, pp. 45-46.

Bharata[1]). The passage illustrating this fourth variety is quoted from the MDR, in accordance with the Abhi.[2]; and curiously enough the SD quotes the same passage as an example of Patākāsthānaka (third variety) as well as Gaṇḍa.[3] This may lead us to think that the SD does not consider that there is any distinction between the two but then the SD does not clarify it. Abhinava seems to have felt this difficulty earlier and points out the distinction as follows :

" The Patākāsthānaka serves to fulfil the desired object (as in the illustration quoted from the MDR) but Gaṇḍa has no such purpose to serve. On the contrary, Gaṇḍa has always some evil implication in it ". The ND has already clearly brought out this point following the Abhi. This evil import of Gaṇḍa, it asserts, is suggested by the etymology of the very word ' Gaṇḍa '.

In his article on " The Problem of Patākāsthānaka ",[4] Dr. V. M. Kulkarni brings out another point of difference. He scrutinizes the definition of Gaṇḍa given by the DR as well as the ND, both of which lay stress on suddenness of speech[5]. Thus Gaṇḍa has an element of abruptness.

The ND mentions another variety of Gaṇḍa called Cūlikā Gaṇḍa. It differs from ordinary Gaṇḍa only in one respect, viz., in Cūlikā Gaṇḍa the character does not come actually on the stage, but the matter is suggested by the voice ' behind the scenes ' (usually by use of paranomastic words).

(iv) *Prapañca* :

Prapañca is defined as a humorous conversation (between two persons) that is untrue and becomes advantageous to one[6]. The ND does not comment upon this definition given in the Kārikā being quite simple and straightway illustrates it from the Ratnāvalī. When the king and the Vidūṣaka are engrossed in seeing the portrait of Sāgarikā, Susaṁgatā approaches and tells that she knew the whole matter and was going to convey it to the queen; whereupon the King being alarmed that lest the cat would

1. Vide NS (GOS) XIX, 33.
2. Vide Abhi. III, p. 21.
3. The illustration quoted is from the Veṇī. (Act III) where the word " Bhagna " when connected with ' Ūruyugma ' suggests the future event, viz., breaking of the thighs of Duryodhana by Bhīma. SD, pp. 179, 219.
4. J. U. B. Vol. XXIV, Part 2, p. 92.
5. DR – ' Sahasoditaṁ ' – III 18, ND Akasmāt, p. 137.
6. ND II, 97 cd. Abhinava remarks that Prapañca is so called because it consists of speaking in a different way (or manner) (Anyathābhidhānāt prapañcaḥ)–Abhi. II, p. 456.

be out of the bag, coaxes her by pointing out that it was simply a pass-time and should not be told to the queen and then offers her the ear-ornament[1].

The ND gives another view under 'Kecit' according to which Prapañca consists in mutual praise based one noble (!) qualities such as skill in seducing others' wives which constitutes, really speaking, a vice and consequently arouses laughter. The illustration is from the Karpūramañjarī of Rājaśekhara where Bhairavānanda indulges in a similar self-eulogy. He admires his sect by saying, "Who does not appreciate this law of Kaulas where a widow was the lawful spouse, flesh was to be eaten and liquor drunk, the meals were obtained by begging and bed was made of leather-piece?"

Clearly enough the view refers to none else but the DR. Even the illustration is quoted from the DR. It is not easy to say whether the ND agrees here with the DR.[2] The BP literally copies the definition of the DR and illustrates it from the Nāg. III, I. The verse is in praise of Baladeva and Cupid.

The ND mentions still a third view which holds that Prapañca means vain humour accompanied by eulogy which does not bring advantage to any of the two. The illustration is from Prayogābhyudaya. Here a maid-servant tries to tease Vidūṣaka who often becomes the laughing stock of maids by calling him a servant (Ceṭa) whereupon the Vidūṣaka retorts that he was the lord of the wretched maids (Ghaṭadāsīs); but after teasing the Vidūṣaka she tries to pacify him by calling him 'Bhaṭṭaputra' and the Vidūṣaka in his turn pacifies her by calling her Āryā. Thus it becomes ridiculous much more when the maid begins to praise the intellect of the Vidūṣaka and the latter praises her beauty by calling her very beautiful, and we are reminded of the popular Sanskrit maxim "Aho rūpaṁ, aho dhvaniḥ".

It is difficult to decide whose view is referred to here under the name 'Anye'. Of course, the view differs from Bharata only in so far as it does not require that the humorous talk should bring advantage to any party.

---

1. RTN, pp. 51–52.

2. The NLR does not recognize this Aṅga and mentions Añcita instead, which occurs when many senses are introduced or where there are paranomastic words. This is nothing but Pun or a figure based on Pun. The two illustrations support this, both of which constitute Upamā based on Ślesa.

NLR adds a note that some read Prapañca instead of Añcita. The definition is practically the same as that of the DR.

Bharata defines this limb as Asadbhūta vacana[1] consisting of mutual praise which causes humour and brings advantage to one. Abhinava explains the word 'Asadbhūta as 'false' (Asatya)[2]. The SD also seems to interpret it similarly[3]. Dhanika interprets the word as immoral relations with others' wives etc. (Pāradāryādinaipuṇyādi)[4].

(v) *Trigata* :

Trigata is to find out, from a word or a sentence, a sense which is quite different from what is actually meant. This is because a word can convey a variety of meanings[5].

To illustrate the point the ND quotes a very long passage from the Devīcandragupta, Act II, where there is an interesting dialogue between the King Rāmagupta and the prince Candragupta disguised as Dhruvadevī[6]. Here the speech uttered in one sense is taken in a different sense by Dhruvadevī as the words carry double meaning.

Trigata is possible even when one sentence which in the form of a question carries one meaning while the same an account of the similarity of sound when understood in the form of on answer conveys an altogether different meaning. The example quoted is from the Vikram. The King asks the hill - "O, you King of all hills ! Did you see the lovely damsel charming with all limbs, separated from me in this lovely forest ?" The same sentence being echoed by the hill forms the answer, as it were, from the hill - "Oh, you King of all kings ! I have seen the lovely damsel charming with all limbs, separated from you in this lovely forest."[7]

Thus one and the same sentence forms the question and the answer as well.

The ND gives a third definition of Trigata. When different senses are conjectured from some word or sound which are ambiguous in character we have Trigata. The ND quotes an illustration from the Vīthī called Indulekhā. The King hearing some jingling sound thinks - "Friend, is it the sweet cooing of the royal swans ? Or is it the humming of the bees ? Or is it the jingling sound of the anklet on the foot of the goddess of my heart ?"

---

1. NS (GOS) XVIII, 120-121.
2. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 456.
3. SD, pp. 217-218.
4. DR, p. 66.
5. ND, p. 141.
6. ND, pp. 141-142.
7. Here the two meanings are available by means of "*Kāku*."

A rhetorician would immediately exclaim, "This is nothing but the figure Sandeha - (or Sasandeha)".

(vi) *Chala* :

Chala consists in speech which is uttered with a different purpose and which causes different reactions, such as humour, deceit, anger, etc., to different persons.

The illustration runs as under :

'Who is not furious seeing the lower lip of the beloved wounded? May you who smelt a lotus with a bee (inside) even though prevented now bear the consequences.'

This is a speech apparently addressed to a Nāyikā, by her clever friend. The Nāyikā has indulged in an illicit loves-portwith a paramour, and as a result has received a wound on the lip. The clever girl-friend knows this and in order to free the Nāyikā from the suspicious eyes of her husband and others utters this warning note so that the lady may refrain from such rash dalliance and at the same time to assure the husband that the Nāyikā is quite chaste and the wound was caused by a bee as she was smelling a lotus. This ingenious speech serves so many purposes over and above the direct one, viz., it assures the husband of his wife's chastity, arouses laughter among the learned audience, deceives the girl's father-in-law and others, and infuriates the co-wife.

The definition of the ND strictly follows Bharata's NS.[1] The illustration too seems to have been borrowed from the Abhinavabhāratī[2].

The DR defines it as deceiving a person by the use of the words of seeming courtesy but boding ill.[3]

(vii) *Asatpralāpa* :

Asatpralāpa is beneficial advice in fact but which is not understood to be so by persons who are devoid of judgment and are stupid, on account of their lack of judgment and stupidity. Thus to them the prattle sounds to be bad, and so it is called Asatpralāpa[4].

The ND gives one illustration to elucidate Avivecakatva and two to explain Maurkhya. The first illustration is from the Rāmābhyudaya, Act II[5]. There Mārīca, in fact, gives a very beneficial piece of advice to Rāvaṇa

1. Cf. NS XVIII, 123 cd.
2. Vide NS (GOS) Vol. 2, p. 457-58.
3. DR III, 17. Also cf. ND VI, 258.
4. ND, pp. 143-144. ND here follows NS XVIII, 119.
5. ND, p. 144.

warning him that Rāma ought not to be considered as an ordinary person or a hermit. But Rāvaṇa who is blinded by pride and lacks in judgment on the contrary rebukes him so severely. Thus Rāvaṇa out of lack of judgment does not believe the speech of Mārīca to be beneficial.

Another example based in foolishness is from the Manoramā-vatsarāja of Bhīmaṭa where the spirit of the speech of Rumaṇvat is grasped by Yaugandharāyaṇa but is not understood by Vāsavadattā and Saṁbhramaka, a servant of Yaugandharāyaṇa, on account of their foolishness.

The ND gives still another exemple to illustrate the point. A prince who is addicted to vices asks the minister's son as to what brings happiness, whereupon the latter replies[1], "He alone acquires the abundance of money and pleasure who is always the conquerer of Akṣa (i.e. dice, and also, sense-organs) and is eager for 'Surāsevana' (i.e., drinking of wine, and also, the worship of Gods)". There the apparent and pleasant meaning of playing dice and drinking liquor is accepted by the prince on account of folly and the other meaning of conquering one's sense-organs and worshipping gods which forms good advice is thrown away. Here the two totally different senses arise on account of the use of paronomastic words viz., Akṣa and Surāsevana.

The ND gives another view on this point according to which Asat-pralāpa means 'irrelevant prattling of a child or an anxious man (Utkaṇṭhita) etc.' That this view is held by the DR is clear from its definition along with the commentary on it[2]. Even the illustration is from the DR itself[3]. "May the speech of Kārtikeya, viz., one, three, nine, eight, seven, etc., which maintains no order due to childhood bring you welfare". Another illustration is from the Raghuvilāsa where Rāma separated from Sītā addresses (like an insane person) a deer and a parrot. The DR quotes a similar illustration from the Vikramorvaśīya where Purūravā, separated from Urvaśī, goes on addressing birds etc. in the same way.

The SD seems to synthesize both the views when it mentions three types of Asatpralāpa : (i) irrelevant speech, (ii) irrelevant answer and (iii) benevolent advice to a fool who is not going to accept it.

(viii) *Vākkelī*

Vākkelī, as the very name suggests, consists in play on words.

---

1. This illustration is borrowed from the Abhi. Vol. II, p. 456.
2. Cf. DR III, 20 ab.

Väkkelī is of two types : (i) a single reply to one or two or many questions or (ii) a humorous and witty dialogue.

(i) This is a sort of riddle or Prahelikā where the answer is contained in the verse itself. Here one or more questions have only one answer ; e. g.,

" How do the rivers appear after the monsoon has passed away ? Who should be perfectly conquered internally and externally as well by a wise or virtuous man ? (The answer is) 'Arayaḥ' "[1] which has two meanings : (a) devoid of speed i. e. slow and (b) enemies.

Here there is only one answer to two questions.

(ii) Here there is a series of questions and clever answers. The ND quotes a famous verse as an illustration :

"Who is at the door ? "

" I am Hari." [(i) Kṛṣṇa (ii) monkey]

" What has a monkey to do here ? "

" I am Kṛṣṇa " [(i) Kṛṣṇa (ii) black]

" Oh then I excessively dread a black (Kṛṣṇa) monkey."

" Oh simple one, I am Madhusūdana." [(i) Kṛṣṇa (ii) sucker of honey i. e. a bee]

" Go then to a tender creeper full of honey."

May Hari who is thus silenced by his beloved protect you.

The DR holds a different view. According to it Väkkelī consists in interruption of a sentence (leaving the sense incomplete). The ND mentions this view of the DR under the usual phrase 'Kecit'[2] and quotes the illustration given by the DR. The illustration is from the UTR where Vāsantī refrains from her speech.[3]

A student of the Alaṁkāraśāstra will easily see that this is nothing but the figure " Ākṣepa ".

Another type of Väkkelī, according to the DR, is a humorous dialogue[4]. The illustration is from the RTN[5] where the Vidūṣaka makes pun on the word 'Khaṇḍa' taking it as 'sugar.'

---

1. This illustration is found in the Abhi. Vol. II, p. 456. The Abhi. merely quotes this verse but does not explain. The *ND* explains it a little and so the point becomes quite clear.
2. ND, p. 146.
3. UTR III, 26.
4. DR III, 17; also cf. SD VI, 259.
5. RTN, p. 16.

This variety is the same as the second variety of Vākkelī mentioned by the ND. The above illustration of the DR is also very similar to that of the ND (second variety).

(ix) *Nālikā* :

Nālikā may be defined as 'a deceitful answer concealing the real sense which causes humour'[1]. The ND illustrates from the Ratnāvalī where Susaṅgatā makes fun of Sāgarikā by saying, "Here is the object for whom you have come" and when asked as to for whom she had come, her reply is not 'the King' which is the true and intended one but 'the picture-board'[2]. Thus the latter is silenced.

The ND mentions a view of others (Kecit) who take Nālikā as an enigmatic answer to a question concealing the (real) sense under joking words.

This view is not different from that of the DR which defines it in almost identical words.[3] But the illustration of the DR is from the MDR[4] where the riddle arises out of pun on the word "Candra" (which means the 'moon' as well as King Candragupta). Moreover the DR obviously seems to follow the NS which considers Nālikā to be a Prahelikā[5]. But Abhi. while explaining the definition given by the NS takes the word 'Prahelikā' not in its ordinary sense, viz, a riddle but as a 'highly jocular speech' which is the etymological sense of the word[6].

In fact, there is not much of distinction between the two views. According to both Nālikā contains an element of humour and is likely to deceive others as the real sense is concealed. The only difference is that in the latter view the enigmatic nature of Nālikā is emphasized, while in the former view, (i. e. of the ND) it is simply for humour. That is why probably the authors of the ND have quoted the same illustration from the RTN to illustrate the Sandyanga Narma also which is defined as "Krīḍāyai hasanaṁ"[7].

(x) *Mṛdava* :

'When merits are turned into demerits and vice versa it is called Mṛdava'. The word 'Mṛdava' consists of two words 'Mṛd' to destroy, to refute + 'Av' to protect or to support. Mṛdava is so called because

1. Here the ND has clearly followed the Abhi.
2. RTN, p. 50. The same illustration is quoted by Abhi. also.
3. Vide DR III, 19 cd.
4. DR, p. 68.
5. NS (GOS) XVIII, 118.
6. Prakarṣeṇa helikā narmādikrīḍārūpaṁ yasyāḥ sā prahelikā. Abhi. II, p. 455.
7. ND, p. 74.

there the view of the opposite party is refuted (Mṛd) and one's own view or proposition is maintained and supported (Av)[1]. Thus Mṛdava is of two types : (i) where merit is represented as fault and (ii) where fault is represented as merit. The first variety is illustrated from the Veṇīsaṁhāra (II, 25), where Duryodhana derides Arjuna, the wielder of the Gāṇḍīva bow, who kept mum when Pāñcālī was shamelessly pulled by Duḥśāsana in the presence of all kings.

Here the merits viz., holding a bow etc., are represented as fault. The ND illustrates this variety further from two of Rāmacandra's works, the Nalavilāsa[2] and the Sudhākalaśa[3].

(ii) Where fault is represented as merit, e. g., in the NLV the hero says –

"How is it possible that all would have lovely damsels in their houses ? A just king punishes a person who seduces others' wives. Cupid commands even Prajāpati. Where would a man tormented by passion go if there were no harlots ?"[4]

Here prostitution which is a vice is represented as a virtue and a social necessity.

The ND illustrates also from the Sudhākalaśa wherein too being virtueless which is a fault is represented as a merit[5].

A third variety is possible by a combination of the earlier two varieties i. e. a merit is represented as a fault simultaneously with a fault being represented as a merit. The illustration is found in the next verse[6]. Here goodness which is a virtue is represented as a fault and ordinariness which is a fault is represented otherwise[7]. It may be noted here that this very Vīthyaṅga develops into a figure of sense called Vyājastuti which consists in apparent praise or censure while the purport is quite otherwise, by representing fault as merit and vice versa[8].

(xi) *Udghātyaka* :

Udghātyaka consists in a dialogue in the form of questions and

---

1. ND follows Abhi. in giving this etymological explanation. Cf. Abhi. (GOS) Vol. II, p. 457.
2. NLV III, 26.
3. ND, p. 148.
4. NLV III, 13.
5. ND, p. 148.
6. ND, p. 149 (lines 1 to 6).
7. The very illustration is found in DR too; vide DR, p. 69.
8. Cf. Definition by Mammaṭa : Vyājastutiḥ mukhe nindā stutir vā rūḍhir anyathā –KP X, 26.

answers in explanation of something not easily understood[1].

Here even though the person who puts the question is, in fact, capable of giving the same answer still he asks in order to verify as to what he thinks is correct or not.

The illustration is from the prologue of the Pāṇḍavānanda where there is a dialogue between the stage-manager and the actor[2].

"What is an ornament of the brave?"

"Forbearance."

"What is an insult?"

"Which is given by one's own kinsmen."

"What is misery?"

"Dependence upon others."

"Who is to be admired in this world?"

"The person who is resorted to by others."

"What is death?"

"Misfortune."

"Who are not unhappy?"

"Those who have conquered their enemies."

"Who know this well?"

"Pāṇḍavas who live in disguise in the city of Virāṭa."[3]

The NS defines this 'Anga' as under:

'If in order to explain them men connect words of obscure meaning with words other than (those intended by the speaker) it becomes Accidental Interpretation (Udghātyaka)'.[4] The ND has verbally followed the definition of Bharata. The DR gives two varieties of Udghātyaka:- (i) Gūḍhārthapadaparyāyamālā (ii) Praśnottaramālā[5]. The ND seems to have ignored this first variety of the DR.

(xii) *Avalagita* :

(i) Avalagita occurs when a desired object is obtained under the pretext of doing something else. It is so called because one clings to

1. The ND appears to have followed Abhi. here.

2. Vide ND p. 149. This example is probably borrowed by the ND from Abhinava. Cf. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 454. The same example is found in the DR too. Cf. DR, p. 65.

3. It will easily be seen that this is the second variety of the figure "Uttara."

4. M. Ghosh : Nātyaśāstra, p. 374.

5. DR III, 13.

another work for accomplishing a particular one (ava+lag = to cling to), e.g., in the UTR Sītā who had a pregnancy-desire to go to the forest for pleasure was abandoned in the forest through the fear of public scandal under the pretext of satisfying her pregnancy-desire[1].

(ii) The ND mentions the view of 'some' who define it as doing some other work having entrusted one's own work to some other character[2]. The illustration is cited from the prologue of the Kṛtyārāvaṇa where the stage-manager being fed up with his profession of acting decides to work for the welfare in the other world having entrusted his present job to his wife and others[3].

(iii) There is still another view which the ND mentions under "Apare". According to this view Avalagita occurs when some work is automatically accomplished while some other is actually started. The point is illustrated from the Chalitarāma. When Rāma, while entering Ayodhyā, descends from the areal car thinking that it was not proper for him to enter Ayodhyā devoid of his father, in car and as he alights from the car he happens to see a person with matted hair and rosary of Akṣa and a chowry in the hand, standing before the pair of sandles under the throne, who is none else than Bharata. Thus another action, viz., the meeting with Bharata has been accomplished automatically while descending for another reason[4].

The DR[5] divides this Aṅga into two – (i) where another action is accomplished being included in one, (ii) when one is started (or is relevent), another is accomplished.

The first variety of the DR corresponds to the view of the ND (1st view); even the illustrations are common. The second variety of the DR also corresponds to the third view of "Kecit" mentioned by the ND. The illustrations also are the same in both[6].

Udghātyaka and Avalagita seem to form a pair. The NS considers these two as two of the five divisions of Āmukha or Prastāvanā[7]. Of course all the Vīthyaṅgas have their importance in a Prologue as both the NS as well as the DR ascertain the necessity of their use in the Prologue[8].

---

1. ND, p. 149.
2. The view evidently belongs to the SP (MS) p. 185.
3. ND, p. 150.
4. The view is held by the DR.
5. DR III, 14.
6. DR, p. 66, ND, p. 150.
7. NS (GOS) XX, 33.
8. NS (GOS) XX, 31 and DR III, 8-9.

Still the NS gives a special importance to these two by considering them as types of Prastāvanā.

It will be noted that the illustrations quoted by the ND for explaining this pair are from the prologues of the dramas while it is not so in the case of the rest of the Vīthyaṅgas.

(xiii) *Avaspandita* :

When a particular thing which is uttered only for description or so suggests some other sense, it is called Avaspandita (The root is √Spand with Ava (to throb), so called because it suggests some internal sense like the throbbing of eyes, etc., e.g.,

The Dhārtarāṣṭras (i.e. the swans) having charming wings, who deck the quarters (as they fly along), whose activities are wild through joy descend on the earth on account of the particular season[1].

Here the description of swans at the time of autumn is taken in a different sense altogether (by the actor) foreshadowing grave misfortune of Kauravas, the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra.

There is another illustration from Chalitarāma[2].

In the first illustration the second meaning is provided by Abhidhāmūlā Vyañjanā.

The second example appears to constitute Vyājokti. Here Sītā tries to conceal the fact (by modifying the statement a little) which has been revealed unconsciously.

These thirteen Vīthyaṅgas are to be used in all plays and in all Sandhis. They can be introduced also in the Prologue. This is why they are treated differently from Sandhyaṅgas[3].

The above remark suggests that essentially there is little distinction between Sandhyaṅgas and Vīthyaṅgas so far as the nature of both is concerned. Hence the purpose of both of them is also the same. The ND, therefore, does not treat separately the purpose of the Vīthyaṅgas but takes it as understood in the six-fold purpose of Sandyaṅgas mentioned earlier[4].

---

1. Veṇī. I, 6.
2. Here Sītā advises Lava and Kuśa to go to the King (Rāma) and greet him with modesty. Lava asks the reason for it, whereupon the truth escapes Sītā's lips, viz., he was the father of them both, but soon she corrects this slip by saying, "He is not your father only but he is the father of all his people."
3. ND, p. 151, lines 7-9.
4. Vide ND, p. 115.

Critical Remarks :

It is clear from the earlier discussion of Vīthī and the examination of its definition as given by the ND and others, that the chief purpose of Vīthī is to provide a drama full of witty speeches. It has only one or two characters only. Thus we can imagine that it cannot emphasize the elements of drama such as action, forceful dialogues, deep sentiments etc. This will almost be a monologue just as Bhāṇa is. Thus the chief Vṛtti will be Bhāratī only, and the Vīthyaṅgas which are based on strikingness of speech will have a very important place in this type of drama.

It has been already stated that the Vīthyaṅgas are not to be taken as the limbs of Vīthī only. Like the Sandhyaṅgas which too should not be taken as limbs of a particular Sandhi, they can be employed in any type of Rūpaka. The reason why they are called the limbs of Vīthī is simply this that they are predominantly found in Vīthī[1]. Vīthī, as the name suggests, centres round such crooked striking speeches only and so the Vīthyangas become a part and parcel of it. For other Rūpakas such speeches are welcome but they are not all in all (as in Vīthī); and that is why the ND points out that Vīthī is helpful to all other Rūpakas.

Unlike the Sandhyaṅgas, the Vīthyaṅgas can be employed in Prastāvanā also. Bharata admits of only two of the Vīthyaṅgas in the prologue, but the DR improves upon the NS by pointing out that any of the Vīthyaṅgas can occur in Prastāvanā. Prastāvanā being the opening scene of the play should be made as interesting and captivating as the playwright can. " Well begun is half done ". The first impression is often the last impression. It has, therefore, been ordained that Prastāvanā should consist of witty and interesting speeches[2].

The Vīthyaṅgas can be supposed to have something common with the Alaṁkāras. The Vīthyaṅgas are based on Vakrokti or indirect speech[3]. The root of all the figures of speech is also nothing but an indirect striking way of representing simple things[4]. Thus Vakrokti is the root of both Vīthyaṅgas as well as Alaṁkāras. Moreover, it will be seen that some of the Vīthyaṅgas are very similar to the figures, e. g., Mṛdava which is representation of virtue as vice and vice versa[5] is as good as

1. Cf. Prādhānyena vyapadeśāḥ bhavati. Similar is the case with many of the Sandhyaṅgas which though incorporated in a particular Sandhi can occur in other Sandhis as well.
2. Citraiḥ Vākyaiḥ.................. – SD VI, 32.
3. Vakroktimārgeṇa gamanāt vīthīva vīthī – ND, p. 132.
4. Cf. KP–Saiṣā sarvatra vakroktiḥ anayā arthaḥ vibhāvyate...etc. p. 744.
5. Vyatyayo guṇadoṣayoḥ – ND, p. 147.

Vyājastuti Alaṁkāra[1]. Similarly Vākkelī which is defined (by some) as 'refraining from saying a thing desired to be said' is in no way different from the figure Ākṣepa[2]. Moreover, Trigata which is defined by some as "applying different senses to a word or sound on accout of similarity or semblance" often turns into the figure Sandeha which is clear from the illustration itself as given by the ND.[3] The illustration of Vākkelī also which is defined as humorous discourse (questions and answers) resembles Prahelikā[4].

The illustration of Udghātyak[illegible]o whi[illegible]ed as secret parlance between the two cannot but remi[illegible]d us of t[illegible]ure Uttara[5].

Avalagita is also near to the figure Samādhi (when one object is accomplished by another cause) or Viśeṣa when the limb is explained as 'accomplishment of an object automatically when another task has been undertaken.' The definition of Avaspandita is almost the same as that of Vakrokti given by the SD[6]. It is also very much similar to Chekāpahnuti, in so far as both consist in clever concealment of what has been unknowingly given out.

Thus it will be clearly perceived that the Vīthyaṅgas bear a considerable resemblance with some of the later Alaṁkāras. It is very likely that some of these Vīthyaṅgas themselves might have later on developed into figures of speech.

They can be said to contain early seeds for certain figures of speech.

But apart from this, there is some distinction between the Alaṁkāras and Vīthyaṅgas. Vīthyaṅgas are of the nature of question and answer (or a witty dialogue) while the Alaṁkāras consist of striking speech only. Similarly, some of the Vīthyaṅgas may resemble some of the Sandhyaṅgas in the outward form. But here too the two are to be distinguished from each other as the latter are meant to help the plot primarily, they being in fact, the divisions of the plot.

---

1. For definition read KP, X, 26.
2. For definition read KP, X, 20-21.
3. Kiṁ nu kalahaṁsanādo madhuro madhupāyināṁ nu jhaṅkāraḥ...etc. ND, p 143.
4. Nadīnāṁ meghavigame kā śobhā pratibhāsate; Bāhyāntarā vijetavyā ke nāma kṛtinā rayaḥ—ND, p. 143.
5. Vide ND, p. 149.
6. SD X, 9.

CHAPTER III

VṚTTI, RASA, BHĀVA AND ABHINAYA

Vṛtti[1] :

In chapter III of the ND the authors take up some of the topics which are vitally connected with poetry, such as Vṛtti, Rasa, Bhāva, and Abhinaya. The chapter commences with the discussion of Vṛtti.

The authors, at the outset, explain the term Vṛtti as "activity with a view to obtain cherished end".[2] Vṛttis are reckoned to be the "Mothers of Drama"[3]. Action is the soul of drama It is through action that plot develops. In the absence of action the drama would come to a stand-still. Thus Vṛttis are rightly called the mothers - the birth-place - of drama. The Vṛttis are not independent but are inter-related and intimately associated with the sentiment (Rasa). Bhāva, and Abhinaya, as action is always in keeping with the sentiment or emotion to be conveyed.

Activity can theoretically be divided into physical, verbal and mental[4]. But all these three types of activities cannot be separated from one another since they are so much interrelated. Physical activity is inevitably blended with vocal and mental ones. Thinking too is mental speaking, in the sense that though we do not speak loudly, in mind we do utter the words which imply a particular thought. We have to think always when and before we act. Similarly mental and verbal activities are dependent on physical one. When one speaks, one has to take assistance of the vocal organs of the body, viz, tongue, palate, etc. Mind too can work only when the body in the form of breath etc., functions properly.

Thus the authors of the ND point out that these activities are interrelated. One of these activities is more prominent and the others are subservient to it. And that is how the division into the four types of Vṛttis takes place, based on the prominance of one over the other.

---

1. This topic has been elaborately discussed by Dr. Raghavan in his learned paper on 'Vṛtti'. The present treatment is based chiefly on what the ND has stated about the same.
2. Puruṣārthasādhako vicitro vyāpāro vṛttiḥ ND, p 154.
3. Vide ND III, 103.
4. Abhi. (III, pp. 20-21) declares that Bhāratī indicates verbal activity; Sātvatī refers to the mental and Ārabhaṭī to physical one. Whatever is graceful is Kaiśikī.

   The word Vṛtti is variously explained by different scholars. It can be derived from the root 'vṛt' to be. Thus Vṛtti means "a state of being". It is also used in the popular language in the sense of mental state or disposition. Cf. SK II, 34.

In fact there is only one Vṛtti comprising of so many activities. So Vṛttis are rightly called " Mothers of Drama ". They are equally important even in other forms of literature.

The Vṛttis are divided into four types : Bhāratī Sātvatī, Kaiśikī and Ārabhaṭī. The ND describes the nature of each of these in their order :

(1) *BHĀRATĪ*-

In the Kārikā No. 104 the authors of the ND describe the nature of Bhāratī from which the following points m[illegible] easily deduced :

(a) It is primarily connected with spee[illegible]

(b) It can be introduced in all types of drama.

(c) It specially occupies Āmukha and Prarocanā.

(d) Generally speaking it is in Sanskrit and can represent all types of Rasas. Sometimes it can be used in Prakrit also

(e) Other Vṛttis namely Sātvatī, Kaiśikī and Ārabhaṭī have gesticulation i. e. Abhinaya as the most important element, while Bhāratī is essentially verbal i. e. related to speech only. Verbal gesticulation will be Sātvatī.

The authors of the ND here rightly criticize Bharata. Bharata's definition (NS XXII, 25) is open to criticism. Bharata divides the eight Rasas among the four Vṛttis and points out that Bhāratī represents Bībhatsa and Karuṇa sentiments. The authors of the ND differ on this point and propound that Bhāratī can represent or convey any sentiment. Bhāratī refers to speech and all the dramas and sentiments are primarily concerned with speech. So the restriction which Bharata has imposed upon Bhāratī cannot be literally accepted. The DR seems to have understood this difficulty earlier and hence declares that Bhāratī Vṛtti is present everywhere[2].

The ND finds out another contradiction in the NS. The NS restricts

1. The word Bhāratī literally means language or speech. The ND does not try to give any further etymology of the word Clearly enough Bhāratī can be associated with Bharata and will mean "of or belonging to Bharata". It is so called because it is invented by sage Bharata or it is the Vṛtti of the actors (Bharatas). Bharata himself gives this etymology. Vide NS (KM) XX, 25.

Bharata gives another rather strange derivation of Bhāratī from Bhāra. While giving the mythological origin of Vṛttis at the time of a combat between Viṣṇu and the demons, the earth felt the burden (bhāra) and thus Bhāratī was created (NS XX, 11). Abhinava has rightly remarked that this etymology is based solely on the basis of similarity of sound. Bharata might have been misled here by Yāska, the author of Nirukta, who allows a word to be derived even on such verbal similarity.

2. Vṛttiḥ sarvatra bhāratī......DR II, 62.

Bhāratī to Bībhatsa and Karuṇa[1] only but while discussing its nature Bharata points out that it can be introduced in Vīthī which has all the sentiments in it and Prahasana which is dominated by the sentiment of laughter (Hāsya). It can also come in Bhāṇa which has love or heroic as the principal sentiment. In fact, Vīthī and Prahasana are considered to be the two of the Aṅgas of Bhāratī.

Here the attack is not specified against any special work but it appears to be directed specially against the NS The ND also disagrees with the NS and points out that Bhāratī can be introduced in any of the twelve types of drama.

Āmukha[2]

Bhāratī is specially found in Āmukha and Prarocanā. Āmukha is the introductory dialogue between the Sūtradhāra and his wife Naṭī or Vidūṣaka or other actors. They introduce the subject-matter, the title of the drama and the dramatist to the audience and eulogize them. Here no special sentiment is to be conveyed. The actual drama starts after Āmukha is over Here no special Abhinaya (except Vācika) is essential. It is really the speech that dominates here. Āmukha is expected to suggest the relevant matter by simple or striking speeches. The speeches can be rendered striking by introducing any of the thirteen Vīthyaṅgas.

Sūtradhāra is at times replaced by Sthāpaka.

The definition of Āmukha given by the ND seems to echo the NS[3]. The ND brings out the same thing in a compact form. It includes in one verse what Bharata states in two verses. The ND has taken care to see that no point is missed. The ND uses the word 'Mārṣa' instead of 'Pāripārśvika' of Bharata and explains the word in the commentary as Pāripārśvika.

The ND explains the word 'Āmukha' in two ways from the point of view of etymology -

(1) The word Āmukha can be split up into two parts : Ā and Mukha.

1. Association of Bhāratī with Karuṇa can easily be understood Karuṇa which chiefly consists of lamentation is replete with pathetic utterances and does not approve of much of physical action but it is difficult to understand Bhāratī's special association with Bībhatsa. Moreover, other Rasas like Adbhuta, Śānta, etc. are also related to speech. Dr. Raghavan has correctly pointed out that Bhāratī cannot be limited to prologue or a particular sentiment only. No drama can stand without it (J. O. R. Vol. VI, part IV, pp. 367-68).

2. It is also known as Prastāvanā or Sthāpanā.

3. Cf. NS XX, 30-31.

'Ā' is a prefix in the sense of 'upto' denoting 'limit'[1] Āmukha therefore will mean "Upto Mukha". It is so called because it spreads upto the beginning of Mukha Sandhi. Āmukha ends where Mukha commences.

(2) 'Ā' can also be interpreted as 'slight.'[2] Āmukha is 'slightly Mukha.' i.e. it suggests Mukha. Āmukha should suggest the Mukha Sandhi or plot. It gives background of the story which is very essential to understand and appreciate the story fully. It also introduces to the reader or spectator the nature of Mukha with which the play starts. It is called Prastāvanā because it introduces Mukha.

Āmukha starts at the end of Pūrvaraṅga. The authors of the ND point out that in the stage-direction "Nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhāraḥ", the word Nāndī stands for the whole of Pūrvaranga[3].

Authors now treat the problem as to how the characters of the drama should enter the stage at the end of Āmukha. The rules of dramaturgy demand that a main character should not enter abruptly without any introduction. So Sūtradhāra or Sthāpaka should directly or indirectly announce the entry of a character. The following are the devices which may be resorted to in order to make the entry of a character natural and dramatic :

(1) The character enters, having caught the *words* (either a word, or a phrase or a sentence) uttered by the stage-manager or others, as it happens in the RTN where Yaugandharāyaṇa enters having caught the actual words of the stage-manager, viz., "Propitious fate brings at once the desired object even from a different isle ....." etc.[4]

(2) The last words of the stage-manager or other actors are heard by the character which enters. The character catches the *sense* which becomes the cause for his introduction on the stage, e. g., the entry of Bhīma in the Veṇī. with the words, "Can the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra remain at peace when I am alive?" by catching the sense of the stage-manager's speech.

(3) By reference to *time or season*. The character is mentioned in comparison to some season by the stage-director. The ND (also the DR and the ND) illustrates from the Chalitarāma where the stage-manager,

1. The same explanation is found in Abhi. in a similar language. Vide Abhi. III, p. 93 line 2

2. Vide Amarakośa, p. 272

3. In English this is known as a figure of speech called Metonymy i. e. a part for the whole.

4. Vide RTN I, 6.

as he describes the autumn season, impliedly heralds the entrance of Rāma on the stage. The description of autumn brings in a reference to Rāma who destroys Rāvaṇa as autumn destroys (i. e. supersedes) the rainy season.

(4) By personal reference to the *character*. In order to connect drama and its Āmukha the character is actually mentioned by name by the stage-manager with the words : "Here is Mr. so and so, etc." The Āmukha of the Śāk. is of this type.

Critical Observations :

Here the ND seems to have improved upon the earlier divisions of Āmukha. To begin with, Bharata divides Āmukha into five types : (i) Udghātyaka, (ii) Kathodghāta, (iii) Prayogātiśaya, (iv) Pravṛttaka and (v) Avalagita[1]. It can easily be seen here that Udghātyaka and Avalagita are in fact two of the Vīthyaṅgas and it is not clear why they should be taken as the limbs of the Āmukha also. The NS points out in this context that the Vīthyaṅgas may be used in Āmukha[2]. So it is but natural that Vīthyaṅgas may be introduced in the prologue so as to render it striking and fascinating But it is no use considering them as special types or limbs of prologue. Moreover, it is rather queer as to why only two of the thirteen Vīthyaṅgas are selected and reckoned as the types of Āmukha. The DR seems to have thought about this problem and consequently omits these two and gives us only three of the five types of Āmukha given by the NS, viz. Kathodghāta, Pravṛttaka and Prayogātiśaya. The DR, however, observes that any of the thirteen Vīthyaṅgas can occur in Āmukha.

But the ND goes a step further than the DR. Is it necessary to have this type of division of Āmukha or prologue at all ? In fact, the types of Āmukha do not reveal the true inherent nature of Āmukha. These types are based merely on the problem as to how the main character may be introduced on the stage for the first time.

Āmukha, in fact, has many more purposes to serve, viz., introduction of the play, its subject-matter, name (and brief history, if the author feels like giving) of the playwright, the praise of the learned audience, etc. The introduction of a character forms the end of Āmukha which should be well connected with the drama proper, otherwise Āmukha would appear to be quite segregated. This is, in other words, one of the purposes but not the sole nature of Āmukha.

The ND therefore thinks that this type of classification is of little use, and treats it as the method of introducing a character, which, of course, forms an essential part of Āmukha (Āmukhāṅgabhūta).

1. Vide NS (GOS) XX, 33.
2. Vide NS (GOS) XX, 31.

Out of the above-mentioned devices for the entry of a character the first two are what Bharata calls Kathodghāta type of Āmukha[1]. The instance cited by the ND to illustrate the entry of the character having caught the sense (Artha) of the words uttered in Āmukha is also the same as the one of the DR for Kathodghāta. No. 3 is the same as Pravṛttaka of the NS and the DR. The illustrations also are common in the ND and the DR. No. 4 is identical with Prayogātiśaya type of the NS and the DR. Both the DR and the ND give the same illustration from the Śāk.

Another reason for the above-mentioned change of the ND may be ascribed to the authors' keenness for simplicity. The authors aim at making the work as simple as possible and avoid unnecessary divisions. The ND introduces new technical words only when it is indispensable to do so.

What is more noteworthy here is that the ND does not follow the traditionnl divisions and subdivisions. All the Sanskrit dramaturgists have followed Bharata in this case with the exception of the ND which refuses to accept any authority blindly.

PRAROCANĀ :

Prarocanā is defined as a means of attracting the audience by praising the merits (of the poet, the work and the audience).

The Pūrvaraṅga consists of preliminaries on the stage before the actual drama begins. This is divided into 19 parts : nine to be performed inside the curtain and the remaining ten to be performed outside the curtain The performance of these has been ordained by the old preceptors. But the authors of the ND neglect it, advancing the following reasons :

(1) They are quite self-evident among the masses.

(2) The order of their performance is futile.

(3) Their purpose viz., gratification of the various gods is merely deceiving the credulous people.

The Prarocanā, though a part of Pūrvaraṅga, in defined here as it has a special importance in Nāṭya.

Now the authors give the reason as to why it is so called. Prarocanā is so called because it makes the particular subject-matter highly agreeable,[2] by arousing eagerness to see and hear among the audience by praising the merits of the play. The authors then illustrate it from the prologues of the Abhinavarāghava, the RV and the NLV.

1. Bharata's NS (GOS Vol. III) XX, 35.

2. Prakṛto 'rthaḥ prakarṣeṇa rocyate ..anayeti prarocanā.-ND, p. 155,

The nineteen Aṅgas of Pūrvaraṅga are given in the NS. Prarocanā is the last of these 19 Aṅgas. The ND refuses to accept the remaining ones taking them to be useless and redundant. It also severely criticizes the whole of Pūrvaraṅga describing it to be meant for deceiving the innocent votaries.

Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra state that Prarocanā is a part of Pūrvaraṅga ceremony. But, in fact, the illustration that is given is from Prastāvanā or Āmukha. Here the authors seem to confuse the two Prarocanās - one of Pūrvaraṅga and the other of Āmukha.

From this it may be inferred that in the times of the ND, the distinction between the Prarocanā of Pūrvaraṅga and that of Āmukha (i. e. of the poet) was lost and in fact the long procedure of Pūrvaraṅga was being curtailed.

SĀTVATĪ :

Sātvatī is that Vṛtti which is born in Sattva i. e. mind. It pertains to the mental activity which should be revealed by mental, verbal and physical gesticulations. Although there are all the three types of gesticulations, mental one alone is principal, other two being subordinate. It must have simplicity, joy, insult or humiliation, forbearance, etc. Its principal sentiments must be Vīra, Raudra, and Śānta. As it constitutes joy it has no Karuṇa. It also includes forbearance and so no Autsukya or Śṛṅgāra. It also includes Adbhuta.

The etymological explanation of Sātvatī is in accordance with the Abhi. (Vol. III, p. 96). The explanation of the word Ādharṣa too is identical with that of the Abhi. (III, p. 97).

It is rather strange that the ND does not give a single instance of this Vṛtti, especially when it illustrates all the rest. The Abhi. illustrates it from the Veṇī[1].

The NS (and the DR following the NS) divides the Sātvatī Vṛtti into four subdivisions : Utthāpaka, Parivartaka, Sallāpaka and Saṁghātya. This division is not so essential and points only to the ancient Hindu mentality which is so fond of giving divisions and subdivisions. The ND with its particiliar bent for simplicity avoids this without any loss of essential information.

But it is difficult to understand as to why only two Rasas-Vīra and Adbhuta-should be included in this Vṛtti. It may also be suggested that Satva may be taken here to mean 'spirit'. Sātvatī therefore is to be employed when spirited action has to be represented.

1. Vide Abhi. III, pp. 97-99.

KAIŚIKI :

Etymologically the word means that which is dominated by or chiefly concerned with Kaiśikās i e. women, who are naturally possessed of long hair[1]. The chief sentiments are love and humour. On account of the preponderance of these two sentiments the dress should be appropriate to this sentiment and amorous gestures. It must also have dramatic elements such as dance, music and Narma (which consists in humour, refined mocking in order to attract the beloved by speech, refined action or dress[2].)

The ND illustrates each variety, viz, how humour can be created by speech, garment and action. It gives illustrations to explain each of of these three kinds of Narma, viz, by speech, dress and action. All these illustrations are borrowed from the DR. Over and above these identical illustrations, the definition of Narma as given by the ND is almost the same as that of the DR.

The authors have put in a concise form what the NS describes in so many words. The NS, for instance, says 'Bahunṛttagītā', for which the ND puts one word only and that is Nāṭya and explains the word Nāṭya in the commentary as *Nṛtta*, Gīta and Vāditra. Thus the ND gives in only one line all necessary elements of the particular Vṛtti. Bharata's Kārikās are explanatory, hardly concise. The ND tries to make its Kārikās as brief, pointed and perfect as possible.

The NS[3] divides the Kaiśikī into four - Narma, Narmasfuñja, Narmasfoṭa and Narmagarbha and explains each. The DR follows the NS but the ND ignores these divisions.

Here too all the three types of activities are present. Śṛṅgāra which means love, signifies mental activity Hāsya and other forms of Narma suggest vocal activity, and Nāṭya (i. e, dance, music etc.) signifies physical activity.

ĀRABHAṬI :

The Abhi. explains this as follows - Where the qualities of Ārabhaṭas, viz., fury, violence, insolence, wildness, etc. dominate, the Vṛtti is known

1. This etymology seems to have been suggested by Abhinava who derives it from Keśa, i. e hair which are meant chiefly for decoration. The word is similarly derived by many later scholars. It is possible that Bharata's explanation of Kaiśikī being born out of graceful movement of Visnu's hands while trying to tie the dishevelled locks of hair might have suggested the etymology mentioned above. Dr Raghavan ridicules this etymology and suggests that it should be derived from Krathakaiśika or Kaiśika, the capital of Vidarbha.
2. Agrāmya iṣṭāvarjanarūpaḥ parihāsaḥ narma - DR, p. 57. Narma is a Sandhyaṅga also.
3. Cf. NS XX, 56 to 62.

as Ārabhaṭī. The ND clarifies it still further by explaining the word Ārabhaṭī : " Which abounds in Ārabhaṭa i. e. arrogant people "[1].

This Vṛtti portrays untruth, fraud, magic. There are also battles with missiles, duals, etc.

There are all types of Abhinayas and all types of activities. Abhinava calls it a Kāyavṛtti probably because it is a Vṛtti of force and violence which indicates physical activity.

It is possessed of Dīptarasas i. e. Raudra, Bībhatsa etc.

It is opposed to Kaiśikī which indicates grace and tenderness.

Critical Observations :

The authors of the ND choose their illustrations as usual from Abhinava. The illustrations from the Veṇī. and the RBh are mentioned by the Ābhi. (Vol. III, p. 104 lines 1-2). The illustration from the KTR has also been verbally borrowed from the Abhi. by our authors (Abhi. Vol. III, p. 104 lines 11 to 14.).

The authors here ordain Dīptarasas i. e. Raudra and Vīra especially. Now Vīra is the dominant sentiment of Sātvatī also. This is really confusing. The characteristics are overlapping and so the definitions are defective.

The NS also is not clear about this point. The NS makes the division of sentiments into four groups, each comprising of two Rasas. Thus, Kaiśikī has Śṛṅgāra and Hāsya Sātvatī has Vīra and Adbhuta. Ārabhaṭī has Raudra and Bhayānaka. Bhāratī has Bībhatsa and Karuṇa[2].

But here too there is a good deal of apparent inconsistency. Bharata while discussing Rasas[3] points out that out of the eight sentiments four are principal and other four are derived from these principal four. Accordingly Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Bībhatsa are the principal Rasas out of which are born Hāsya, Adbhuta, Karuṇa and Bhayānaka respectively. So naturally we expect that these subordinate sentiments should be connected with their respective principal ones. This is seen in the first two viz. Kaiśikī and Sātvatī, where Śṛṅgāra and Vīra are associated with Hāsya and Adbhuta respectively. But when we come to Ārabhaṭī it is associated with Raudra and Bhayānaka which is a subordinate Rasa to Bībhatsa according to Bharata himself. Similarly Bībhatsa and Karuṇa are mixed in Bhāratī when Karuṇa is connected with Raudra. Though it is true that this division of Bharata regarding Rasas being principal and subordinate is

1. Āreṇa pratodakena tulyā bhaṭā uddhatāḥ puruṣā ārabhaṭās te santy āsām iti..... ārabhaṭī. ND, p. 158.
2. Cf. NS XX, 73-74.
3. Cf. NS VI, 40.

not scientific and universally acceptable[1], Bharata should have taken note of this point. The DR has correctly borne this point it mind and does not mention the subordinate Rasas at all. It points out that Kaiśikī depicts Śṛṅgāra, Sātvatī depicts Vīra, Ārabhaṭī denotes Raudra and Bībhatsa while Bhāratī permeates all Rasas[2]. Here the so called subordinate Rasas are not mentioned at all. Only the principal ones are mentioned, they being the representatives of their subordinate ones.

The DR's division seems to be more acceptable as it is more scientific. It has understood the nature of Bhāratī Vṛtti which literally means 'pertaining to speech' which underlies in fact the whole range of literature.

Bharata restricts it to Bībhatsa and Karuṇa only, both of which have less of physical activity and more of verbal one. But Bhāratī is ordained in Prahasana which has humour as its principal sentiment. The ND therefore seems justified when it levies an attack on the NS pointing out this discrepancy

But the ND itself is not quite clear in pointing out the distinction between Sātvatī and Ārabhaṭī both of which have Dīpta Rasas.

The DR seems to be quite logical and reasonable when it divides the different Rasas explicitly for the particular Vṛtti.

The concept of Vṛtti seems to have been quite clear even in the times of Bharata. Bharata gives a mythical account of the origin of Vṛttis[3]. Of course, it is not possible to understand the account literally. The whole account makes it clear that Vṛtti is related primarily with activity. The three activities of mind, body and speech are interrelated. Vṛtti is primarily related with physical activity while Rīti is related with speech[4].

The high place ascribed to Vṛtti in drama clearly points out that the Indian dramaturgists were not ignorant of the importance of action in a play. According to the western critics drama comprises of action and they think that Indian classical writers have not taken any note of this point. They charge Sanskrit dramas for not having speedy action. But here we see that they are mistaken. Indian theorists call Vṛtti which signifies action as 'the mother of drama'.

Abhinava explains the four Vṛttis in terms of action (Ceṣṭā) or Abhinaya. Thus Bhāratī refers to Vākceṣṭā or Vācikābhinaya. Sātvatī

1. The point has been discussed later in this chapter.
2. Vide DR II, 62
3. NS (GOS) XX, 1-25.
4. Cf. Vilāsavinyāsakramo vṛttiḥ, vacanavinyāsakramo rītiḥ. -Kāvyamīmāṁsā, p. 9.

refers to Manaśceṣṭā or Sātvikābhinaya and the remaining two refer to Kāyacesta or Āṅgikābhinaya; the Kaiśikī suggests graceful action while Ārabhaṭī implies wild action both being two aspects of Āṅgikābhinaya.

Prof. Gupta defines it is "the mental disposition of particular personages in particular situation."[1]

It should be noted here that Bharata gives four subdivisions (Vṛttyaṅgas) of each of the four Vṛttis. In these divisions he is followed by the later works like the DR, the SD, etc. The ND seems to have purposefully omitted these subdivisions probably because they do not appear to be so scientific.[2]

RASA :

After the discussion of Vṛttis the ND turns to what is reckoned by Indian rhetoricians as the very essence of poetry, viz., Rasa or Sentiment. Rasa[3] is defined by the ND as "Permanent state brought to a high pitch by means of Vibhāvas and Vyabhicāri-Bhāvas and perceptible through Anubhāvas."

In the commentary the ND explains the terms Bhāva,[4] Vibhāva, Anubhāva etc.

Sthāyī is that dominant state which remains permanent even when other states incessantly come and depart. It is called Bhāva since it becomes (√Bhū to be or to become) Rasa when brought to a high pitch.

Vibhāvas which are the causes of Rasa are of two types (i) Ālaṁbana (ii) Uddīpana[5].

Vyabhicārīs go to nourish the dominant state.

The ND has followed here the celebrated dictum of the NS of Bharata,

---

1. The Indian Theatre, p. 16.
2. In writing this topic I have made use of Dr. V. Raghavan's article on 'Vṛttis'.
3. The word Rasa is used in a variety of senses :-
   (1) In Vaiśeṣika philosophy Rasa means a quality to be cognized by the organ of of taste. Rasas are six, e. g., bitter, sour, sweet etc. This is the meaning ascribed to Rasa in common language.
   (2) In Āyurveda it stands for semen or constituent fluid of the body.
   (3) It also stands for so many other things such as water, drink, juice, desire or liking, love, pleasure, essence, mercury, mineral substance etc.
   (4) In Poetics it stands for the sentiment or aesthetic pleasure.
4. The NS explains it thus – (i) Bhāvas are so called because they reveal (Bhāvayanti) the Rasas being united with the different types of Abhinaya, NS (KM) VII, p. 104. (ii) It is so called as it reveals the internal purport of the poet (NS XXII, 8.)
5. All these have been treated in detail later on.

the oldest exponent of Rasa School, viz., "Rasa is produced by the unison of Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Sañcāri Bhāvas"[1]. The relation between Sthāyī and Rasa is very clearly brought out. Rasa and Sthāyī are not essentially different. Rasa is another name of Sthāyī[2].

The sentiments are nine in number. The NS of Bharata refers to eight only[3]. But later theorists (including Abhinavagupta) include Śānta as the ninth one. The ND also includes it and takes it as an independent Rasa.

The ND divides the sentiments into two -

(i) those that bring joy i. e. pleasant. These are five : Śṛṅgāra, Hāsya, Vīra, Adbhuta and Śānta.

(ii) those that bring pain i. e. painful. These are four : Karuṇa, Raudra, Bībhatsa and Bhayānaka.

The ND here differs from the majority of Indian rhetoricians who hold that Rasa is always pleasant. The joy that the experience of Rasa gives is compared with the joy that arises out of the realization of Brahman (Brahmānandasahodara). Even though the emotions of sorrow, fear, fury etc. as we experience in our ordinary life do not produce joy, the experience of the same in literature does produce aesthetic delight. The experiences of life are quite different in that way from those of literature. The Nāṭyadarpaṇa is possibly the earliest to specifically divide the sentiments as pleasant and painful. The ND offers a very systematic series of arguments in support of its theory.

The ND's arguments run as under :

1. The Vibhāvas of the pleasant sentiments are agreeable and pleasant, while those of unpleasant ones are unpleasant, e. g., the two types of Vibhāvas-Ālambana and Uddīpana-of a pleasant sentiment like love will be a king and a princess or some beautiful damsel, a garden, the spring, flowers, fragrant breezes, sweet notes of the cuckoo, lotus-tanks, etc., while those of the unpleasant like Bībhatsa and Bhāyānaka will be demons, ghosts, war, blood-shed, death etc.

2. To say that all the sentiments are pleasant is against the actual experience. In actual life the sentiments like Bhayānaka, Karuṇa, Bībhatsa or Raudra are highly painful and that is why people turn their faces

1. Kaver antargataṁ bhāvaṁ bhāvayan bhāva ucyate - NS (KM) XXII, 8.
2. NS VI, 43 also Cf Abhi. I, p. 278. Sthāyī exalted by Vibhāvas etc. is Rasa. He also quotes the authority of Daṇḍin. Cf. Rati assumes the form of Śṛṅgāra, and Krodha of Raudra (Kāvyādarśa II, 281, 283).
3. Cf. NS (KM) VI, 16.
4. This point will be elaborated later.

away from Bhayānaka etc. Not to talk of the actual Bhayānaka or Karuṇa but even that represented in poetry, (i. e. even the imitation of the sentiment) produces indescribable pain.[1]

3. If we experience a sort of strikingness even from these sentiments it is due to the talents of the poet and/or the actor in representing a thing vividly in a realistic manner. The heroic persons exhibit amazement at an enemy who cuts off the head at one stroke. Thus deceived by the strikingness caused by the art and skill of the poet and/or the actor the wise people experience high ecstatic delight even in the painful sentiments like Karuna and others. And with a view to tasting this the audience or spectators also turn towards them.[2]

4. Moreover, the poet while delineating the life of a character depicts it as intermingled with joy and sorrow in accordance with the actual human life which is a mixture of both. Literature is defined as mirror of life and in order that it may rightly reflect life it should have joy and sorrow as well.[3]

5. There is another reason for introducing the sorrowful sentiments in poetry. Pleasures become really more enjoyable when put in contrast with the experience of sorrow just as the sweetness of a drink becomes more enjoyable after some chilly taste.[4]

6. Moreover, what sort of joy can the Sahṛdayas experience as they witness such scenes as abduction of Sītā, pulling of hair and garments of Draupadī, Hariścandra serving a Cāṇḍāla, death of Rohitāśva, Lakṣmaṇa being struck by a missile, commencement of killing Mālatī, etc., being enacted on the stage ? The tragic states of the above-mentioned noble souls when imitated on the stage shall naturally produce sorrow in the hearts of the sympathetic spectators.

---

१. यत् पुनः सर्वरसानां सुखात्मकत्वमुच्यते, तत् प्रतीतबाधितम् । आस्तां नाम मुख्यविभावोपचितः काव्यभिनयोपनीतविभावोपचितोऽपि भयानको बीभत्सः करुणो रौद्रो वा रसास्वादवतामनाख्येयां कामपि क्लेशदशामुपनयति । अत एव भयानकादिभिरुद्विजते समाजः । न नाम सुखास्वादादुद्वेगो घटते । — नाटयदर्पण, पृ. १५९

२. यत् पुनरेभिरपि चमत्कारो दृश्यते, स रसास्वादविरामे सति यथावस्थितवस्तुप्रदर्शकेन कवि-नट-शक्ति-कौशलेन । विस्मयन्ते हि शिरश्छेदकारिणाऽपि प्रहारकुशलेन वैरिणा शौण्डीरमानिनः । अनेनैव च सर्वाङ्गाह्लादकेन कवि-नट-शक्तिजन्मना चमत्कारेण विप्रलब्धाः परमानन्दरूपतां दुःखात्मकेष्वपि करुणादिषु सुमेधसः प्रतिजानते । एतदास्वादलौल्येन प्रेक्षका अपि एतेषु प्रवर्तन्ते । — नाटयदर्पण, पृ० १५९

३. कवयस्तु सुखदुःखात्मकसंसारानुरूप्येण रामादिचरितं निबध्नन्तः सुखदुःखात्मकरसानुविद्धमेव प्रथ्नन्ति । —ना० द०, पृ० १५९

४. पानकमाधुर्यमिव च तीक्ष्णास्वादेन सुतरां सुखानि स्वदन्ते इति । — ना० द०, पृ० १५९

If, on the other hand, these sorrowful events produce joy when imitated it cannot be called a faithful imitation. There should be definitely something wrong with the imitation itself as it appears quite differently (Imitation should be of the same nature as the original)[1]

7. Some miserable souls deploring the death of their beloveds derive apparent joy when tragic is being staged. But in the true sense that is a feeling of sorrow only. An unhappy man alone will feel joy (or satisfaction) at the story of an unhappy man and will be unhappy on hearing some joyful story.[2]

Thus it can be concluded that Karuṇa etc., produce sorrow only.

Critical Observations :

The authors of the ND appear to be the foremost among the rhetoricians to present the view forcefully that all sentiments do not go to produce joy. This view of the dual nature of sentiments is not however totally new. While commenting upon the Rasa-sūtra of Bharata Abhinava points out that according to the Sāṅkhyas Rasa is pleasant as well as painful. Abhinava also fefers to the view of 'some' who assert that by "Ādi" in "Harṣādīn cādhigacchanti"[3] Bharata means "pain, etc."[4]. (Of course, Abhinava does not agree with the view). The same view is expressed in Rasakalikā of Rudrabhaṭṭa who holds that Rasa is capable of producing pleasure as well as pain[5] and propounds that even Śṛṅgāra is not purely pleasant if we take into account Vipralambha.

Vāmana also gives a verse to the effect that in tragic plays there is a mixture of pleasure and pain[6]. The verse has been quoted by Hemacandra in his own commentary on the KS called Viveka.

---

१. अपि च सीताया हरणम्, द्रौपद्याः कचाम्बराकर्षणम्, हरिचन्द्रस्य चाण्डालदास्यम्, रोहिताश्वस्य मरणम्, मालत्या व्यापादनारम्भणमित्याद्यभिनीयमानं पश्यतां सहृदयानां को नाम सुखास्वादः? तथाऽनुकार्यगताश्च करुणादयः परिदेवितानुकार्यत्वात् तावत् दुःखात्मका एव। यदि चानुकरणे सुखात्मानः स्युर्न सम्यगनुकरणं स्यात्, विपरीतत्वेन भासनात्। — ना० द०, पृ० १५९

२. योऽपीष्टादिविनाशदुःखवतां करुणे वर्ण्यमानेऽभिनीयमाने वा सुखास्वादः सोऽपि परमार्थतो दुःखास्वाद एव। — ना० द०, पृ० १५९

3. Yathā, hi nānāvyañjanasaṁskṛtam annam bhuñjānā rasān āsvādayanti .....tathā...... sthāyibhāvān āsvādayanti .. *harṣādīn* cādhigacchanti - NS (GOS) Vol. I, p. 289.

4. Anye tvādiśabdena śokādīnām atra saṁgrahaḥ, sa na yuktaḥ-Abhi. Vol. I, p. 289.

5. Rasasya sukhaduḥkhātmakatayā tadubhayalakṣaṇatvena upapadyate — Rasakalikā (Mad. MS) pp. 51-52 quoted by Dr. V. Raghavan in 'The Number of Rasas'.

6. Karuṇaprekṣaṇīyeṣu samplavaḥ sukhaduḥkhayoḥ,
Yathānubhavataḥ siddhas tathaivojaḥprasādayoḥ.

—Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra III, 1, 9 p. 26

Dr. V. Raghavan has also mentioned the view of Haripāla who takes Vipralambha as painful[1]. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in his Bhaktirasāyaṇa points out that there is a difference of degree in the pleasure arising out of different Rasas. That is to say that all Rasas do not yield the same type of pleasure[2].

Thus it appears that there was a school of thought which believed that all Rasas were not pleasant[3]. Yet Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra seem to be the first (and also the foremost) to discuss elaborately, extensively and systematically this view offering their arguments for their theory. They certainly deserve credit for holding out strongly against all the prominent theorists (including their own preceptor to whom great reverence is shown in the concluding verses of the ND) who unanimously believe that all Rasas produce nothing but joy. Rasa by virtue of its definition implies that it must be enjoyable, agreeable and pleasant[4] irrespective of its kind and the joy that is derived is of the supreme quality fit to be compared with the joy that sages derive at the time of the realisation of Brahman[5]. Hemacandra also, following Mammaṭa, calls this joy as Parabrahmāsvādasodara[6].

The ND, therefore, is unique in making bold to chalk out a new path setting aside the old and established one. Dr. Rakesha Gupta has well appreciated this boldness and showers praises for the same. He states, "In the whole range of Sanskrit Poetics there is, however, one work, viz., Nāṭyadārpaṇa, the authors of which had the courage to maintain, even against the tradition, that the end of all poetry is not to please..."[7]. Dr. K. N. Watve also gives credit to our authors for their independent thinking and boldness[8]. Still it has got to be

1. J. O. R. Madras Vol. XI pp. 113-114, 107.
2. Bhaktirasāyaṇa, p. 22.
3. Prof. Deshpande opines that there were two schools of thought regarding the nature of Rasa. According to one which he calls Paripuṣṭivāda, the Rasa is the same as Sthāyibhāva (Sthāyī eva rasaḥ). Its followers were Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka, Sāṅkhyas, Bhoja and Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra. The other school was known as Abhivyaktivāda or Carvaṇāvāda or Kevalānandavāda which believed that Rasa was quite different from the dominant state (sthāyivilakṣaṇo rasaḥ) and the followers of the school were Ānandavardhana, Bhaṭṭatauta, Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa, Hemacandra, Viśvanātha, Prabhākara, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and Jagannātha.
4. Rasyate āsvādyate iti rasaḥ.
5. Cf. KP IV, p. 93.
6. KS, p. 88.
7. Psychological studies in Rasas, p. 68.
8. Rasavimarśa, p. 177.

accepted that the theory of the ND could not win much of popularity on account of some of its obvious drawbacks. All the same, it did have an impact on some of the later writers. Siddhicandragaṇi refers to a view ascribing it to the 'moderners' who accept only four Rasas and are not prepared to grant Karuṇa, Raudra, Bhayānaka and Bībhatsa (including Śānta) the status of "Rasa" at all[1]. According to them to say that tragic (Śoka) etc. produce joy like love (Rati) and others is a mad man's prattle[2]. The reason why the lamentations of Aja and others are described is to unfold their great affection for their beloved. Similarly Śānta is represented to show the complete detachment of the persons striving for beatitude. In the same way, Bhaya is described to show the tenderness of the person. The real fact is that poet, by delineating different sentiments, wants to exhibit his skill in the delineation of the various Rasas[3].

Inspite of all the vigour and enthusiasm with which the authors of the ND have argued out their theory it could not be generally accepted by a majority of critics on account of its several defects notwithstanding the fact that there were some who were influenced by the theory and voted for it.

Let us then try to analyse the above-mentioned arguments of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra. The first argument clearly points out that the authors have made no distinction between the objects of actual life and those depicted in poetry. In life there is a personal affinity to things. For instance, if there is a beautiful flower, the moment one sees it one will try to pluck it, smell it, and possess it, similarly at the sight of a ferocious animal one runs away from it, avoids it, hates it. Thus our worldly experiences are always accompanied by this instinct of love or hate, possess or avoid (Hānopādāna).

The experiences of literature are totally of a different nature. In drama if we see a flower we do not try to possess it, nor do we run away from the theatre when a dreadful ghastly scene is represented. We know in the heart of our hearts that this is after all a play and not real. That is why in life if we see a damsel harassed by some person we may instantly run to her aid but in drama when we see Sītā being abducted by Rāvaṇa and crying for help we remain fixed in our chairs knowing it in deep conscience that it is drama after all.

1. Kāvyaprakāśakhaṇḍana : Navīnās tu śṛṅgāra-vīra-hāsyādbhuta-saṁjñāś catvāra eva rasāḥ. Karuṇādīnāṁ yathā na rasatvaṁ tathā vakṣyate (p 16).
2. Yat tu śokādeyo 'pi ratyādivat svaprakāśajñānasukhātmakā iti tad unmattapralapitaṁ. ibid., p. 21.
3. Ibid., p. 22.

In advancing the second argument also the ND stands on the same footing Even though we do not feel happy of tragic or fierce occurrences in life because of our being directly or personally involved in them, still we appreciate the same in literature when they are depicted purely in a general and impersonal way. If the incidents of literature were to affect us in the same way as those in actual life do we would never go to witness tragic plays. On the contrary, it is the tragedies that have made a greater and deeper appeal to the humanity at large than the comedies. Shelley,* seems to give vent to our own experience when he, in a succinct and apparently paradoxical manner, states, "Our sweetest songs are those that tell of the saddest thought."

The third argument is in reply to the common question viz. "If karuṇa and others produce pain why should we go to see such a drama at all?" The ND's reply is that the strikingness is due to the talents -art and skill (Pratibhā) - of the poet and the actor. It is true that we do appreciate the art of the poet in a realistic delineation of the whole thing and the skill of the actor in representing it, but is it all? In fact, the appreciation of the poet or the actor comes afterwards and not at the time when we are being dragged into the torrents of emotion.

The next argument, though highly ingenious, suffers from the same fallacy. Drama does reflect joys and sorrows of life. It is true that in life the incidents of misery to not bring joy. But the same when represented in literature have a different reaction. Even the depiction of sorrow tends to be pleasant, just as in actual life also one often rejoices in the memory of even sorrowful incidents that may have occured in the past.[1] There is a joy even in weeping. As Shelley has put it, "The pleasure of sorrow is more pleasant than the pleasure of pleasure itself."

The argument that follows cannot be reckoned to be an independent argument. It is in fact a corroboration of the view with concrete illustrations. But let us remember that it is the tragic scenes such as the lamentation of Aja or Rati or Purūravas or the repudiation of Śakuntalā in the Śāk. and tragedies like Hamlet, King Lear or Othello that have won appreciation of one and all and belong to all times and climes. When we witness a pathetic scene such as lamentation of a mother on the sad demise of her only son, the feeling that arises in our mind is not that of miserableness but that of pity or sympathy. The aim of the poet in delineating the noble characters' sufferings is to arouse that sympathy in us and we are not unaware of the joy of sympathizing with others. Man by his very nature demands sympathy from others. A man with none to sympathize with

1. Cf. प्राप्तानि दुःखान्यपि दण्डकायां संचिन्त्यमानानि सुखान्यभूवन् । – रघुवंश.

him will find the life not worth living[1]. For him the life will be a drudgery. But man not only requires sympathizers he is also anxious to extend sympathy to others. There is a joy in giving sympathy as well. It is this sympathy, the inner urge of human heart, that compels him to enjoy even the pathetic scenes. In fact, that piece will have a greater overwhelming effect on the mind which will succeed to the utmost degree in arousing our sympathies. Tragedies are capable of arousing this feeling much more than commedies and that is why they have a greater appeal.

In the last argument the ND has tried to touch a problem concerning human psychology. Life is more replete with misery[2], so we, in fact, are eager to see as to whether the mountains of miseries that fall on us do fall on others too. Thus if we find that others too sail or sink in the same boat as we do, our unhappy, dissatisfied soul finds some relief. Prof. K. Sahal quotes from Dr. Johnson to the above effect But this argument of the ND does not seem to be psychologically faultless.

Here the ND could have added one more argument If Karuṇa too gave pleasure why do we weep and shed tears, when a pathetic scene is being staged ? To say that they are the tears of joy and appreciation is being too far from the actual experience. But the fact is that just as there are tears of joy in the same way, there can be joy in tears as well[3].

There have been various attempts to explain how joy is derived from a tragedy or tragic scenes. In fact, tragedies, from times immemorial, have been the causes of the universal delight. Great poets like Shakespeare have been immortal for their tragedies. The appreciation of the Act IV of the Abhijñānaśākuntala, the master-piece of Kālidāsa, as the best Act[4], also clearly indicates that it is the pathetic scenes which have made universal appeal and won the admiration of all. To deny tragic in literature or pathos will be tantamount to denying some of the best and the finest therein.

It is a matter of general experience that there is pleasure in the

1. Śāk. III, स्निग्धजनसंविभक्तं हि दुःखं सह्यवेदनं भवति । पृष्ठ-५७.
2. Cf. KP, the creation of Brahman is Sukhaduḥkhamohasvabhāvā (I, 1).
3. Dhanika while explaining the the totally different natures of the pathos in literature and that of life compares this peculiar experience of a pathetic scene which causes tears and also delight to the peculiar state which a lady experiences when she receives beating, tooth-bite, etc. from her lover in amorous sports. (DR : Avaloka, p. 98).
4. Tatrāpi ca caturtho 'ṅkaḥ.

tragic too[1]. Some may call it "Katharsis" (Purification or purgation); psychologists may call it sympathetic feeling; the Indian theorists call it Karuṇa Rasa. Some critics try to account for this by reference to the human instinct of imitation which is so natural to man from the early childhood. He learns by imitation and naturally enjoys the works of imitation, and so even though the objects themselves may be painful to see, one delights to view the most realistic representation of them in art[2].

Prof. K. Sahal while discussing the view of the ND remarks that the authors of the ND have failed to comprehend the distinction between pain and pity. When we feel a personal loss, e. g., the sad demise of our own kinsmen, we experience pain. But when we hear of a similar loss of others we feel pity[3]. But the analogy does not seem to be perfect as pity by itself can hardly produce joy.

K. N. Watve tries to explain rather differently how one derives pleasure out of Karuṇa Rasa.[4] According to him Śoka or sorrow is not the Sthāyī Bhāva of Karuṇa since sorrow is a derived emotion It presupposes the existance of some sentiment of love or attachment. "What a sorrowing person does in his woe is that he dwells on his object of attachment, remembers the many occasions of affection, recollects his virtues and admires his excellences that evoked his attachment for him." This becomes the chief object of Carvaṇā or aesthetic enjoyment. Thus Śoka becomes merely a Sañcārī bhāva and not a Sthāyī bhāva which is love.

Rasa, in fact, is a peculiar state of mind where one forgets for some time ego or self-consciousness and is submerged into a blissful state. This state is reached by an absolute concentration of mind. The life-like realistic acting (gesticulation) of the actor, his dress, make-up etc., stagecraft etc., go a long way in producing this mental concentration It is this mental concentration which causes one to forget everything else in life[5] and experince Rasa or aesthetic delight. The different types of states or sentiments are the different means of bringing out this higher mental state which is dominated by Sattva and may be rightly compared to the state at the time of beatitude.

1. In the words of Cowper – There is a pleasure in poetic pain which only poets know.
2. Vide – Aristotle on the Art of Poetry pp. 28–29.
3. Ālocanāke patha para (in Hindi) pp. 48–55 also compare, Psychological Studies in Rasas p. 84.
4. Vide 'The Problem of the Karuṇa Rasa and its Solution (Prof. P. K. Gode Commemoration Vol, pp. 468–70)
5. Cf, KP – Vigalitavedyāntara (p. 9).

The ND then points out the difference between Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa. Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas of both are common. The former also has fever, burning, anxiety, etc. as its Anubhāvas like Karuṇa. But Karuṇa ends in disaster. The fate of Karuṇa is dark and gloomy while Vipralambha ends in reunion. Here there is a hope of meeting again though there is separation for the time being. Thus the hope of reunion decreases the intensity of pathos. In other words Śoka is the dominant state (Sthāyī) in Karuṇa, while it is a momentary state (Vyabhicārī) in Vipralambha.

The next problem tackled by the ND is "To whom does the sentiment really belong ?" The ND states that the Rasa primarily belongs to the actual human life and secondarily to the spectators (or readers in case of poetry).[1]

The ND now proceeds to comment further. It now explains the function of Anubhāvas or consequents. Anubhāvas are the external manifestations of a feeling. They are so called because they convey to us the feelings that really belong to others. They are expressed in numerous ways such as side-long glances, paralysis, perspiration, tears, horripilation and the like.

According to the ND the process by which the spectators experience Rasa seems to be as follows :- The Rasa originally resides in the actual character i. e. Rāma, for instance[2]. This sentiment is made known clearly to the spectators by means of Anubhāvas [3] As a result the same type of sentiment arises in the hearts of the spectators also. This experience of Rasa is not directly perceived as it belongs to the province of mind which is beyond the reach of the organs of sense. In other words it is a variety of Alaukika Pratyakṣa as some others would call it.[4]

The authors of the ND now launch upon another interesting problem as to whether or not an actor experiences Rasa. The ND's view is as follows. It is true that generally an actor does not experience the aesthetic delight. His business is to imitate, act or gesticulate inspite of the fact that he might not be actually experiencing that emotion. He

---

1. Vide रसश्च मुख्यलोकगतः प्रेक्षकगतः, काव्यस्य श्रोत्रनुसन्धायकहृदयगतो वा । – ND, p. 159.

2. इह तावत् सर्वलोकसिद्धा परस्थस्य रसस्य प्रतिपत्तिः । – ND, p. 160.

3. परस्थानपि रसानवबोधयन्तीत्यनुभावाः । – ND, p. 160.

4. This view of Rāmacandra may very well be compared with that of Lollaṭa who also believes that Rasa originally resides in Rāma and others and being superimposed on the actor it gives delight to the spectators. Vide Atra lollaṭādayaḥ rāmādāv anukārye sthito rasaḥ – Rasacandrikā, p. 44.

may have to act weeping when acting the role of a lover in separation, even though he may be delighted at heart. So also perspiration, paralysis, etc. are possible even when the actor himself may not be experiencing the particular feeling. The external manifestations by the actors cause the rise of the dominant emotion in the heart of the spectators which may result in similar expressions such as weeping etc. in the case of the Sahṛdayas.

The ND here points out that it is not that he never experiences Rasa. At times he may. It is here that the ND differs from the majority of critics. The ND corroborates its view by citing a couple of instances from the actual life. A harlot, though entering into amorous dalliance for the pleasure of others, may herself enjoy the pleasure at times. A songster, though singing for delighting others, sometimes experiences supreme pleasure himself. Similarly an actor while playing the role of a character may be totally one with it and experience aesthetic delight.[1]

The problem viz., whether or not an actor experiences Rasa is a debatable one. Some scholors are of the opinion that an actor is required to present a life-like, real and actual state of the character whose role he is playing. In order to achieve this object he should forget himself and be one with the character of the play. He should merge his individual personality into that of the character and should deem the feelings and emotions, states and sentiments of the character as his own. In this case he is likely to experience the sentiment. There are others, on the other hand, who opine that the business of the actor is simply to act. He is required to imitate verbal, physical and mental actions of the character whose role he is playing. He should be perfectly conscious of his duty. If, on the contrary, he forgets himself and establishes complete identity with the character it is quite likely that he would forget what he is required to speak or act and thus would totally fail in creating the desired effect on the minds of the spectators. As for instance, if an actor who is playing a tragic role on the stage starts actually weeping and shedding tears, it will not be possible for him to continue his speech with proper expressions on the face with the

---

1. न च नटस्य रसो न भवतीत्येकान्तः। पण्यस्त्रियो हि धनलोभेन पररत्यर्थं रतादि विपञ्चयन्त्यः कदाचित् स्वयमपि परां रतिमनुभवन्ति। गायनाश्च परं रञ्जयन्तः कदाचित् स्वयमपि रज्यन्ते। एवं नटोऽपि रामादिगतं विप्रलम्भाद्यनुकुर्वाणः कदाचित् स्वयमपि तन्मयीभावमुपयात्येवेति।
— नाट्यदर्पण, पृ० १६०.

result that the beauty of the whole situation will be marred[1].

It appears, therefore, that even though the actor has to merge his personality into that of the character still however he should bear in mind that he has to imitate successfully and his concentration should be for realistic representation.

In fact, he has not to identify himself completely with the character but he has to make a show of complete identity with the character. In order to appear natural and realistic he has to make special efforts. It comes after constant practice and considerable training. There lies the art of the actor, and art, it is rightly said, lies in concealing art Still however, if on certain occasion the actor completely forgets himself, and himself experiences the state and sentiment which he is required to represent he ceases, for the time being, to be an actor and belongs to the category of the Prekṣaka or Bhāvaka.

After reiterating the statement that the Anubhāvas (consequents) in the case of an actor are the determinants or Vibhāvas in the case of the spectators being the cause of producing Rasa in them (while those of the spectators are the after-effects of Rasa) the ND turns to bring out the essential difference between the causes in actual life and those of literature.

In actual life the Vibhāvas etc. are real and so arouse a Sthāyibhāva to the state of Rasa[2] with reference to a particular object only, e. g., a young man who loves a particular lady enjoys the sentiment of love (Śṛṅgāra) with reference to that lady only. But when the sentiment of love is aroused by seeing a lady loving another man (as happens in literature) that sentiment is not related to a particular individual but is of the general nature; similarly, the pathos arising out of seeing a woman lamenting the loss of some dear one is of a general nature; similar

1. Coquellin, a great French actor, in his book on the art of acting quotes an instance from the life of another great actor Edvin Booth who was, one evening, so much absorbed in the part which he was playing that real tears flowed from his eyes, his voice broke with emotion, real sobs chocked him. He thought that he was acting even better than usual but the fact was that he had acted very badly. Coquellin then points to the moral that in order to call forth feeling in others we ourselves must not experience it. He remarks that in all circumstances the actor must retain complete self-control. - M. Belgion : Reading for Profit, quoted in Sāhitya-mīmāṁsā, pp 32-33.

2. ND, p. 160. It appears that the ND has wrongly used the word Rasa here. In actual life what we experience is no Rasa at all. It is at the most a feeling or an emotion which, though akin to Rasa, is much different from it which is confined to literature. It should also be noted that the terms Vibhāva, Anubhāva etc. are terms of literature only and should not be confused with ordinary causes and effects.

is the case with other sentiments also. Thus the emotion (or state) which is aroused in the hearts of the audience or the spectators on reading, hearing or witnessing a literary piece by the determinants which are not real but which appear as real[1] is always general, e. g., when one sees Rāma making love to Sītā, the sentiment of love arising in the spectators is not with reference to Sītā (the daughter of Janaka and the wife of Rāma) but with reference to a woman in general.

Not only the characters but even the emotions, etc. also are generalised and that is why all the spectators feel a sort of oneness with the emotion that is depicted which ultimately results in the experience of of aesthetic joy.

This is how the ND explains the important principle of literary criticism called Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa.

The ND now explains the place of Vyabhicārī Bhāvas. Their task is to stimulate and to intensify the dominant state. The Sthāyī bhāva, aroused by the fundamental (Ālambana) and excitant (Uddīpana) determinants, made perceptible on account of the consequents, needs to be fed and raised to a high pitch in order that it may generate the sentiment. The suitable transitory states are essential for the creation of Rasa. For instance, Śṛṅgāra might require anxiety (Cintā); Karuṇa, dejection (Viṣāda); Raudra, wrath (Amarśa); Bhayānaka, terror (Trāsa) and so on.

The ND opines that Rasa cannot exist without Vyabhicārīs even though it may happen that on account of certain causes, (e. g. subtlety or speed of action) the Rasa may be generated even without the Vyabhicārī. This implies that mostly there is some Vyabhicārī concealed even though it may not be easily detected for one reason or the other. One common illustration from the actual life would make the point quite clear : the sight of a lady by itself cannot produce love in the heart of a man who is attached to some other lady or who is totally dispassionate. That is to say, the transitory states as anxiety, restlessness, etc. are requisites for love.

It is again pointed out that Vyabhicārīs and Anubhāvas seen in the case of an actor are, in fact, the Vibhāvas in the sense that they are the elements which go to produce Rasa in the heart of the spectators.

The ND finally treats of the relation between Kāvya and Rasa. Or in other words where does the Rasa reside ? Rasa resides not in the

1. Cf. Shakespeare – "And as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things Unknown, the poet's pen
Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothings
A local habitation and a name......"

poem or literary piece even though we call it 'Sarasa' i. e. possessed of Rasa. It is obvious that an inanimate thing as Kāvya is, cannot be the substratum of Rasa which is "Cetana". Then why is it that we experience Rasa while reading or witnessing a literary piece ? The answer is simple. We experience Rasa because that piece has a capacity to produce Rasa, even though it by itself does not contain it since if it were so, any ordinary man will experience the same type of Rasa on reading a poem as a learned man. But it is a fact that an illiterate person will not enjoy the poetry at all however great it may be. Rasa is experienced only when the reader or the spectator understands the meaning. Moreover, the reader experiences the Rasa not as an external object as one does when one enjoys the sweet taste of the sweetmeats. The enjoyment of the sweetmeat is totally different from that of poetry.

Rasa is the dominant state of the mind of the reader himself lying dormant in the subconscious region of mind and brought to consciousness when a similar situation is represented[1]. When a piece is read conveying the determinats of horror or pathos, the corresponding dormant emotion is roused and it results into the experience of Rasa. And hence a person who does not possess the required dominant state in his heart cannot enjoy that Rasa. As for instance, a child will not be able to appreciate the story of love because it has never experienced what love is. And that is why in order that one may be capable of enjoying poetry one has got to be a Sahṛdaya.

Now the ND establishes the relation of Anubhāva, Vibhāva and Vyabhicārī Bhāvas to the dominant state (Sthāyī) or Rasa[2].

Anubhāvas (Consequents) : They are the effects (Kārya) of the dominant state or sentiment. They are so called because they indicate the sentiment. They are the external manifestation of a Bhāva. They are thousands in number such as Stambha, Sveda, Vepithu and others[3].

Vibhāva (determinants) : They are the causes (Hetu)[4] of Bhava or Rasa. They are so called because they cause the sthāyī (which already resides in the minds of the spectators as impression (Vāsanā) and which ultimately transforms it into Rasa) to be clearly perceived.

They are of two types :-

(1) *Ālambana vibhāva* (fundamental determinant) comprises of

1. Cf. ND III, 109.
2. ND III, 110.
3. Vide ND III, 147 and the Vṛtti over it.
4. Cf. NS : Vibhāvaḥ, karaṇaṁ, nimittaṁ, hetur iti paryāyāḥ—VII, 5.

characters such as the hero, the heroine and others without whom sentiments cannot arise at all.

(ii) *Uddīpana vibhāva* (excitant determinant) are the conditions of place and time and circumstance, which go to develop (or foster) the Rasa, e. g , the garden, cool breezes, the moon, the cry of the cuckoo etc. for the development of Śṛṅgāra.

It will be clear, therefore, that what we call causes and effects in ordinary life are termed Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas respectively when they are treated in literature.

Vyabhicārī (or Sañcārī) Bhāvas (transitory states) are the states that accompany the Sthāyī Bhāva or Rasa.

The word Vyabhicārī is derived from the root 'car' to move with 'vi' and 'Abhi' (towards). It can be explained in two ways :-

Sthāyibhāvas denote the instincts or emotions deep seated in human mind. The Vyabhicāribhāvas are those that emerge from the Sthāyibhāvas and again submerge in them as the waves in an ocean Their effect is immediate and temporary while that of the Sthāyīs is rooted in the character of man.

The Number of Rasas

According to the ND there are nine principal Rasas. They are :- (1) Śṛṅgāra (2) Hāsya (3) Karuṇa (4) Raudra (5) Vīra (6) Bhayānaka (7) Bībhatsa (8) Adbhuta (9) Śānta[1].

The ND here tries to bring out the underlying relationship among all these.

Out of all the Rasas Śṛṅgāra tops the list as love is pleasant to one and all irrespective of caste and creed. Hāsya follows Śṛṅgāra. Then comes Karuṇa being opposite to Hāsya. Kāma i. e. love or desire is based on wealth. So there comes Raudra having wealth as its principal aim. Vīra is related to Bhayānaka as the essense of Vīra is granting protection to persons who are struck with or overpowered by fear. Spirited persons despise such cowards and so arises Bībhatsa having contempt as its dominant state. Despise is removed through surprise and thus Adbhuta (based on astonishment)[2]. And lastly Dharma is based on restraint and peace and therefore Śānta based on restraint (Śama).

1. The ND literally follows the NS (GOS) VI, 15.

2 The ND here differs from the Abhi. and the KS. The above explanation of the ND may not appear to be so convincing here as Adbhuta is primarily related to Vīra (as heroism breeds wonder) and not to Bībhatsa which is rather contrary to it. Abhinava (and Hemacandra follows) reckons Adbhuta as the result of Vīra. (Abhi. I, p. 267; vide also Bharata - Vīrāc caivādbhutotpattiḥ - NS (GOS) VI, 39)

Only these nine types of Rasa are proclaimed by Pūrvācāryas (ancient preceptors) as they are specially charming and more useful to human activities. But other Rasas also are possible such as Laulya (greediness) having greed as its dominant state, Sneha having compassion (Ārdratā) as its dominant state, Vyasana with attachment (Āsakti) as its dominant state, Duḥkha and Sukha having pain (Arati) and satisfaction (Santoṣa) as their respective dominant states.

Some include these in the above nine only.

Critical Remarks

This is an attempt to bring out a connecting link between the various types of sentiments. The ND makes an effort to establish unity in the vast diversity. In fact, there is a thread of unity passing through all these various sentiments. All these sentiments whether Śṛṅgāra or Vīra, Hāsya or Karuṇa, Adbhuta or Bībhatsa, Raudra or Bhayānaka are all Rasas i. e. they are capable of being enjoyed[1]. They go to produce aesthetic delight which is often compared with the joy derived through the experience of the supreme bliss[2]. These different sentiments such as Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, etc. are the different phases, in fact, of one Rasa like the different shapes of gold. The underlying principle is the same as gold in gold-ornaments or clay in earthen pots.

But the problem arises as to whether the explanation regarding this unity as given by the ND and others is justifiable or correct. The NS reduces the eight sentiments into four principal sentiments and the remaining four as derivative ones. Accordingly, Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Bībhatsa are principal sentiments which give rise to Hāsya, Adbhuta, Karuṇa, and Bhayānaka respectively[3]. The NS also explains the reason for calling the second group as derived one. Hāsya, the NS points out, is an imitation of Śṛṅgāra. Śṛṅgāra itself when improperly and unworthily imitated produces humour and ridicule, like the Śṛṅgāra of rogues and hypocrites. Similarly the action of heroism (Vīra) produces wonder, a feeling of awe and amazement among the spectators (Adbhuta). An action of violence (Raudra) will give rise to Karuṇa or pathos as a violent and furious action is bound to bring tragic results. A phenomenon of Bībhatsa in the same way goes to produce fear in the heart of the spectators (this is Bhayānaka). Thus the rest of the four sentiments are the results or modifications of the first four principal sentiments.

But this, it will be seen, is not so convincing. Is Hāsya a modifica-

1. Rasyate āsvādyate iti rasaḥ. ND, p. 159.
2. Brahmāsvādasahodara - SD III, 2
3. NS (GOS) VI, 39.

tion of Śṛṅgāra only? Do we not find humour even in the absence of Śṛṅgāra or love? Again, is Adbhuta generated from Vīra only? Does the sentiment of pathos originate from violence or fury only and fear from Raudra alone? The answers are not naturally in the affirmative. Humour has a field vaster than that of Śṛṅgāra and cannot be included only therein. Improper representation of any Rasa may tend to produce laughter or Hāsya. Similarly wonder can arise even in the absence of Vīra. Fear need not be the result of Bībhatsa only. Raudra also may as well cause fear. Thus the four derivative sentiments can develop independently of their respective principal sentiments. Moreover, the NS lacks in consistancy when it combines Raudra and Bhayānaka (a subordinate sentiment of Bībhatsa) with Ārabhaṭī and Bībhatsa and Karuṇa under Bhāratī[1].

The DR also follows the NS in this matter[2]. Dhanika actually quotes lines from Bharata[3]. The ND here goes a step forward. It does not rest satisfied with Bharata's division into principal and subordinate Rasas. It establishes a connecting link among all the Rasas. But here the authors of the ND do not stand original. They have almost verbally borrowed from their learned preceptor Hemacandra who gives a just similar account of the interrelation of Rasas and who in his turn appears to have borrowed it from Abhinava[4].

The general conception of Rasa as we have seen is that it is one and uniform like the Brahman of the spiritualists[5]; consequently there have been efforts by various theorists to propagate that there is only one principal sentiment and the others are subordinate to it or are mere variants of it[6].

A slight suggestion to think on these lines seems to have been

---

1 NS (KM) XX, 62–63. Some may try to defend this classification of Bharata by pointing out that by calling the four sentiments principal Bharata only means that they occur more frequently than the other ones. But the defence can hardly be convincing. Karuṇa and Hāsya can be equally dominant. Bhavabhūti goes to the extent of considering Karuṇa as the only sentiment. Hāsya is the dominating sentiment of Prahasana. It is also difficult to understand the propriety in calling Bībhatsa as a principal sentiment.

2. Cf. DR IV, 43–45.

3. Vide DR, p. 97.

4. Vide KS, p. 106; also cf. Abhi. I, p. 267.

5. Upaniṣads describe Brahman as Rasa. cf. Taittirīyopaniṣad - Raso vai saḥ (Brahmānandavalli, p. 116.)

6. Vide Dr. Raghavan : Number of Rasas.

dropped by the early sage Bharata who recognises four sentiments as the principal and the remaining four as being derived from them.

But all such efforts to reduce all the sentiment to one are not likely to meet with much success as the human mind is full of states and emotions which are complex at times and even contradictory, so that to find out unity in the bewildering diversity is a very hard nut to crack. And even though Rasa by itself, in principle, is one and homogeneous, the states (Bhāva) to which the different Rasas correspond are of varied nature.

The number of Rasas has differed with the different authorities. Just as there was a school which believed in one Rasa only and tried to explain all other Rasas in terms of that Rasa in the same way there were theorists who did not find the number eight to be sufficient enough to include all the diverse sentiments and added to the number. It is very probable that Bharata mentioned only eight Rasas[1]. The ninth, viz., Śānta was a later addition; but Śānta has been accepted as the ninth sentiment, by many of the later poeticians. Ānandavardhana and Abhinava consider it as the principal sentiment in the MBh[2].

Some of the writers on dramaturgy, on the other hand, refuse to accept Śānta in drama. Dhanañjaya, for instance, admits of Śānta as a ninth Rasa in poetry but does not recognise it in drama[3]. Dhanika refers to the view of some who do not believe in the existence of Śānta for the following reasons·

(i) The Ācārya i. e. Bharata has not mentioned its Vibhāva, Anubhāva, etc.

(ii) Śānta is not capable of human experience as it implies annihilation of love and hatred which have made a permanent abode in the human mind from times immemorial and are impossible to destroy.

(iii) It can be included in Vīra and Bībhatsa as Bībhatsa whose dominant state is Jugupsā gives rise to dejection, discontent (with the worldly pleasure) which ultimately results in Śama.

But these arguments can easily be refuted It is not proper to advance the theory only on the basis of the authority of the text of the NS which has been so corrupt and mishandled from time to time.

1. Even Abhinava who was a strong propounder of Śānta Rasa, while commenting upon that portion of the NS regarding Śānta Rasa, feels that it was an interpolation as can be inferred from his remark– Ye punar nava rasā iti paṭhanti tanmate Śāntasvarūpaṁ abhidhīyate (Abhi. I, p 332). Kālidāsa also refers to eight Rasas mentioned by Bharata. Vide Vikram. II, 18.

2. Vide Dhv. IV, pp. 467–470.

3. Śamaṁ api kecit prāhuḥ puṣṭir nāṭye tu naitasya–DR IV, 35.

Moreover it would not be right to argue that Śānta does not exist because Bharata does not mention it. The second argument which is based on human psychology is likely to be severely opposed by the Mokṣavādins, who will address these theorists as materialists (Cārvākas). According to Indian philosophy Mokṣa is the highest ideal of human life and so it is heretical to deny it.

Similarly the argument of some who say that Śānta which implies annihilation of Kāma and Dveṣa cannot be represented by the actor who is not free from those dualities, is also invalid as the actor has simply to gesticulate. He does not experience Rasa at all[1].

The third argument also does not appear to be quite sound as even though apathy for wordly pleasures may be a cause for Śama, still however Śānta or Śama is not similar in nature to Bībhatsa or Jugupsā; neither it is proper to include it in Vīra which has Utsāha i. e. vigour as its dominant state. In fact both Jugupsā and Utsāha can come as transitory states of Śanta but neither of them can be the dominant state of Śānta. Dhanika, following Dhanañjaya, holds that Śama cannot have a place in drama as Śama which implies cessation of all activity cannot be represented on stage in drama which is full of action.

The later theorists increase the number of Rasas. Rudraṭa enumerates ten Rasas adding 'Preyas' (with Sneha as the dominant state) to the celebrated nine[2]. Bhoja refers to ten Rasas accepted by the learned, adding Vatsala to the old list of nine[3]. Some add Bhakti. Viśvesvara refers to Māyā as a sentiment with Mithyājñāna as its dominant state[4].

Varieties of Rasa

1. *Śṛṅgāra*

The ND, at the outset, divides Śṛngāra into two types —

(i) Saṁbhoga i. e. love in union

(ii) Vipralaṁbha i. e. love in separation.

The principal Vibhāvas are man and woman. Vibhāvas are music, song, dance, seasons like spring, garland, betel leaf, peculiar dress and ornaments, accompanied by desirable persons and objects such as the Vidūṣaka, the moonrise, Cakravāka, swans, etc.

1. Cf. Aṣṭāv eva rasā nāṭyeṣv iti kecid acūcudan; Tad acāru yataḥ kañcin na rasaṁ svadate naṭaḥ – RG p. 37.
2. KL, p. 166.
3. SP, – Āmnāsiṣur daśa rasā sudhiyo (p. 1). But Bhānudatta does not recognize Vatsala Rasa and includes it in Karuṇa. Vide Rasataraṅgiṇī V, p. 125.
4. Vide Rasacandrikā, p. 68.

It also includes sports such as plucking of flowers, moving in a garden, water-sports, etc.

The dominant state is love (Rati).

It is to be represented by the different types of gesticulation. It should also have vigour (Utsāha) etc.[1]

Its Anubhāvas are mental or physical torture, anger, dancing of eyes, knitting of eyebrows, etc. (in Saṁbhoga), and torture, tears, lamentation, etc. (in Vipralaṁbha). In the former pleasant states such as Dhṛti etc. are introduced; in the latter only painful ones such as Nirveda.

Bharata divides Śṛṅgāra into three varieties caused by speech, by dress, and by physical action. Hāsya and Raudra too are similarly divided. But this division is applicable to all other Rasas also as the above three refer to the three types of Abhinayas which are essential in arousing the sentiments.

2. *Hāsya*

Hāsya arises out of the distortion in behaviour, speech, body and dress and other awkward gestures like blowing one's nose, imitating others, etc, It is represented by the peculiar movement of the nose, lips, eyes, holding of the belly or sides.

Dissimulation (Avahitthā), vigour, wonder, etc. are its transitory states.

Hāsya is divided into six types :-

1. Vihasita, 2. Upahasita: 3. Smita; 4. Hasita: 5. Apahasita, 6. Atihasita.

First two are for middle characters, the next two for high-born persons and the last two for low persons.

This sentiment, as also Karuṇa, Bhayānaka, Bībhatsa and Adbhuta, is freely and abundantly used in the case of low characters or women as they too are deeemed low as compared with men. A low man excessively laughs, weeps, fears, likes slander of others, and is astounded even by an ordinary speech .

The ND has followed here the NS. From the relevant discussion in the NS, the DR, the ND, etc. it is found that Hāsya arises out of distortion or awkwardness in speech, action, dress, facial expressions, etc.

1. Here the ND discusses an interesting point about the state of Utsāha (i. e. vigour). Vigour is the dominant state of Vira and still forms a part of Śṛṅgāra. But the point is that in Śṛṅgāra vigour does not dominate. It comes as a transitory state. And a dominant state of one sentiment can likewise become a transitory state of other sentiments.

This is obviously, a very low kind of humour. Consequently the sentiment itself was looked down upon a little. The statement of the ND that this sentiment is to be freely used in the case of low characters and women, goes to corroborate this view. This particular theory may be held responsible for the lack of intellectual humour in Sanskrit drama. The Indian theorists were rather unaware of the finer type of humour, wits, intelligent jokes which could win applause from the intelligentzia. That is why excepting a few works like the Śākuntala, the Mṛcchakaṭika, etc. we find very little of delightful humour in the whole range of Sanskrit drama. Whatever humour is there is stale and stereotyped, mainly caused by the stupid speech and ugly gestures of the Vidūṣaka.

The definition is too narrow also because it does not take into consideration the humour arising out of the impropriety of sentiments such as Śṛṅgāra and others.

Bharata divides Hāsya into two - (i) Ātmastha, when a person laughs all alone (ii) Parastha, when he makes others laugh though he himself may be perfectly serious. The DR over and above this two-fold division divides each into three, viz., belonging to high, middle or low characters, resulting thereby in six divisions.

3. *Karuṇa*

Karuṇa arises out of death, imprisonment, loss of wealth, curse or calamity. These are the Vibhāvas. Śoka is its dominant state. Its Anubhāvas are tears, paleness of face, loss of memory etc., scolding one's fate, weeping, lamenting, beating one's breasts etc. Nirveda, Glāni, anxiety, eagerness, fatigue, paralysis, tremor, paleness, tears, change of voice etc. are its Vyabhicārīs[1].

4. *Raudra*

The furious arises out of striking with weapons, falsehood, jealousy, treachery, bad policy, committing offence such as criticizing one's knowledge, action, country, caste, etc., depriving one of one's kingdom or wealth etc. It is represented by killing, blood-shed, cutting or breaking of limbs, pressing of lips or teeth, shivering of lips, cheeks, pressing the hands, etc. Distraction, ardour, avarice, inconstancy, fierceness, perspiration, horripilation, tremor, etc. are its transitory states. The ND here points out that even the Sthāyī Bhāvas also may sometimes come in as transitory states[2].

---

1. Here the ND includes the Sāttvika Bhāvas, which are in fact Anubhāvas, in Vyabhicārīs.

2. Cf. ND, p. 168

5. *Vīra*

The heroic (Vīra) arises, out of valour, strength, (physical as well as well as of army, wealth, etc.), justice, reputation due to qualities like heroism which causes terror in the minds of the foes, and determination of the facts (Tattvaviniścaya). Its dominant state is Utsāha which may be regarding different matters such as war, religion, alms-giving, merits, valour, etc.

It is represented by courage, steadfastness, inspiring the army, condemning the foe, giving alms, horripilation, etc. Patience, intellect, pride, anger, memory, horripilation etc. are its transitory states.

Here the ND marks out the distinction between Vīra and Raudra. Both are martial sentiments and in both fight occurs. But the essential distinction is that the former is dominated by enthusiasm and justice while the latter is dominated by infatuation, pride and injustice.

6. *Bhayānaka*

Bhayānaka or dreadful is caused by fearsome creatures like evil spirits, owls, etc., killing or fighting with weapons, a lonely place or forest, a thief or a robber, the offence against an elderly person or a king. On seeing, hearing, or even thinking about the above-mentioned causes, Bhayānaka with Bhaya (or dread) as its dominant state arises. It is to be represented by paralysis, horripilation, tremor, change in facial expressions, drying up of the throat, paleness, swoon, etc. Doubt, infatuation, terror, epilepsy, death, perspiration, tremor, paleness, etc. are its Vyabhicārīs.

7. *Bibhatsa*

It arises out of the perception, seeing or hearing of objects which are highly contemptible or disgustful as they may be dirty or rough or emitting foul smell. It also includes eulogy of the enemy. It has Jugupsā (disgust) as its dominant state, It is represented by splitting, shaking of one's limbs, despising, contracting the body, showing signs of hatred on the face, shutting the nose or ears, heart-ache, etc. Disease, distraction, confusion, epilepsy, death. etc. are its transitory states.

8. *Adbhuta*

It arises out of direct or indirect hearing or perception of divinities, magic, charming objects like architecture, beauty, fragrance, dance, song, and the like, acquiring of one's cherished object, etc. Vismaya or wonder is the dominant state here. It is represented by praising the object, horripilation, indication of joy and wonder such as expansion of eyes, gazing with a steady eye, shaking of garments or fingers, inarticulate or

faltering speech, tremor, perspiration, etc. Confusion, paralysis, tears, horripilation, etc. are its transitory states.

9. *Śānta*

It is caused by the fear of the cycle of birth and death, disgust for the worldly objects, contemplation of the Absolute, perusal of scriptures, etc. It has Śama as its dominant state which implies a mental state of equipoise free from worldly desires, greed, anger, etc. It is to be represented by forbearance, meditation, steady glances, kindness, impartiality, joy, etc. Nirveda (depression), Mati (intellect), memory, Dhṛti (forbearance) etc. are its Vyabhicārīs.

The ND here refers to the view of some who do not believe in Śānta on the ground that drama represents action while Śānta aims at Mokṣa (which implies emancipation from all miseries and which constitutes cessation of activity.).

Critical Remarks :

The above view apparently seems to refer to the DR. The DR asserts that Śama is also reckoned as one of the Rasas by some but it cannot have any place in drama[1].

Dhanika also refuses to accept Śānta on the ground that love and hatred which have firm grip over our minds from times immemorial cannot be annihilated. But this view does not seem to be quite acceptable for the reasons stated earlier[2].

After establishing the position of Śānta as a Rasa we naturally face another problem, viz., what is the Sthāyin of Śānta ?

There are various views regarding the Sthāyī of Śānta[3]. The SR[4] gives five views –

1. Nirveda or despondency.

This Nirveda arises on account of the thought that I did not make efforts for attaining salvation – the highest end – in my earlier births. A sense of remorse and repentance for wasting invaluable human life (or lives) results in Nirveda.

Mammaṭa gives another reason for considerating this as a Sthāyī of

1. DR IV, 35.
2. The view of Dhanika and its criticism has been discussed in detail in this chapter under 'the number of Rasas.'
3. The controversy about the Sthāyī of Śānta is suggested also by the DR when it refers to "Nirveda and others' as the so called Sthāyī of Śānta (DR IV, 36).
4. SR VII, 1374 p. 816.

Śānta, viz., it is mentioned first among Vyabhicārīs by Bharata even though its import is not auspicious[1].

2. Jugupsā i. e. contempt for the sensual pleasures (Viṣaya) without which man would not try for Śama.

3. Utsāha (energy or zest). This implies mental effort to practise the Sādhanacatuṣṭaya.

4. Śama i. e. abstinence from all sensual activities (Indriyavyāpāra).

5. All the above four combined together.

Ānandavardhana considers 'Tṛṣṇākṣayasukha' i. e. annihilation of sensual desires as the Sthāyī of 'Śama[2].

Over and above these, Samyag-jñāna, Dhṛti, Rati, Nirviśeṣaṇacittavṛtti, Sarvacittavṛttipraśama, any of the eight Sthāyīs or all the eight Sthāyīs together are considered to be the Sthāyīs of Śānta.

According to the ND the Sthāyī of Śānta is Śama only. It criticises Mammaṭa for considering Nirveda as the Sthāyī of Śānta[3].

Place of Rasa in Poetry

Word and sense constitute the body of poetry[4] but Rasa or sentiment forms the very soul (of poetry) And having Rasa as its soul it enters the hearts of the appreciative reader or critic. Hence the poets are mainly interested in Rasa. And only that figure of speech enchants the heart, which is introduced in order to bring out Rasa. To make the point quite clear the ND gives as many as four illustrations (two from Rāmacandra's own works and two from others) where figures of word and sense are introduced for Rasa only[5]. The ND then explicitly points out that in poetry figures of speech are not so important as Rasa. A drama or a literary piece replete with figures of speech but devoid of Rasa is compared to a ripe but dry (with no juice) mango which may be attractive in appearance but tastes insipid. Just as such a mango-fruit displeases us, even so does such a poem. Hence some poets who do not go beyond strikingness of word and sense introduce alliteration, pun, etc. This may be appreciated in other forms of poetry but not in drama which is chiefly concerned with sentiment only. The ND condemns such poets as 'dry poets'.[6]

1. KP, p. 116, also cf. Rudraṭa's KL, p. 214.
2. Dhv., p. 300.
3. ND, p. 177. This point has been discussed later.
4. Arthaśabdavapuḥ kāvyaṁ (ND III, 123a). Here the ND seems to follow the definition of Bhāmaha who gives equal importance to word as well as sense in Kāvya. His definition of Kāvya is 'Śabdārthau sahitau kāvyaṁ',
5. Vide ND, pp. 170–171.
6. Śuṣkakavi - ND, p. 171.

Here the ND touches one of the most vital points about literature. From very ancient times there had been a problem of discussion as to what should be the most important element in poetry? What is, in other words, the soul of poetry? Or what forms the guiding principle in poetry? Different rhetoricians propounded their own personal views as a result of which came into being five different schools of poetics.

The ND here points out the importance of Rasa in poetry. Rasa is the very soul of poetry. It is to poetry what fragrance is to a blossomed flower or what sweet juice is to a ripe mango fruit.

Here there is a warning to the poets who indulge themselves merely in ingenious play of word and sense. That is no true poetry. Scholorship in different sciences like Logic and grammar is different from poetic talents. A true poet does not care for the words but rather concentrates on Rasa. Words are merely a medium to convey the particular idea or sentiments. Words are thus means to an end and not an end in themselves. It will be a serious unpardonable blunder on the part of the poet if he neglects the end viz. Rasa and is too much attached to the display of his mastery over vocabulary and grammar.

The influence of Bharata and Abhinava is visible here too. The ND sides with the view of Bharata, viz., Rasa is the soul of poetry, the view which is merely slightly modified and widened by the propounders of Dhvani school viz. Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta. This view grew more and more popular by the advent of time and we find it accepted by almost all later writers on dramaturgy as well as poetics.

Contradictory Rasas[1]

When rasa is accepted to be the summum bonum of dramatic art, it becomes obligatory on the part of the playwright to take utmost care with regard to the development of Rasa in order that it may create a healthy emotional effect on the mind of the spectators. Rasa is so delicate that it demands serious attention of the writer while depicting it. One of the most important points that the dramatist should constantly bear in mind is that he should not fuse together those Rasas which are

1. The following Rasas are generally contradictory Rasas :-
   Śṛṅgāra - Karuṇa, Bībhatsa, Raudra, Bhayānaka.
   Hāsya - Bhayānaka, Karuṇa.
   Karuṇa - Hāsya, Śṛṅgāra.
   Raudra - Śṛṅgāra, Hāsya, Bhayānaka.
   Vīra - Bhayānaka, Śānta.
   Bhayānaka- Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Hāsya.
   Bībhatsa - Śṛgāra.
   Śānta - Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra, Hāsya, Bhayānaka.

contradictory to each other such as Śṛṅgāra and Bībhatsa, Vīra and Bhayānaka, Hāsya and Karuṇa and so on[1]. Coexistence of such contradictory Rasas is very likely to mar the unified effect and so must be avoided.

The ND here states the conditions under which such contradictory Rasas can be fused together and the seeming contradiction removed. The contradictory sentiments sound contradictory only when (i) they are put at one place, (ii) they are independent and (iii) they are equally powerful. So if this contradiction is to be removed the writer may use the following devices :-

The substratum or Āśraya of the two Rasas should be changed. If Vīra is depicted in the case of the hero, Bhayānaka will not strike contradictory if depicted in the case of his rivals.

Moreover contradictory sentiments can stand together under different contexts. Thus Śṛṅgāra and Śānta which are mutually contradictory will not appear to be so when understood in different contexts, e. g., with reference to a lascivious man and a sage, as is possible in the verse – 'Dantakṣatāni karajaiś ca vipāṭitāni......' etc.[2]

Moreover the sentiments appear contradictory specially when they are independent and equally powerful. But this contradiction is removed if one sentiment is made independent and the other one dependent upon it or they should be made subordinate to one principal Rasa. In the former case one sentiment will work as a helpmate to the other. Thus Śṛṅgāra may go a long way to heighten the effect of Karuṇa. Thus the recollection of the pleasures with the dead lover heightens the pathos.

Another way of removing the contradiction is to make the contrdictory Rasas subordinate to some thing else. This is very easy. Even if they are made subordinate to another their contradiction disappears just as the cowives can stay together happily under the supremacy of their lord even though they are rivals.

Again even when residing at one place the contradiction appears only when the sentiments are of equal strength and it would be instantly removed provided one is stronger than the other.

Lastly contradiction appears only when the contradictory sentiments are described simultaneously but not so if they are intercepted by a sentiment which is contrary to neither. Thus in the Nāgānada Śānta

1. Certain Rasas are not contradictory, for instance, Śṛṅgāra and Hāsya, Śṛṅgāra and Vīra, Vīra and Adbhuta, Śṛṅgāra and Adbhuta, etc.
2. Vide ND, p. 172.

which is reflected in the words of the hero "......though contemptible, this youth will secure the fruit of my desire, if it passes away thus while I am serving my parents with devotion"[1] when followed by its contradictory sentiment, viz., Śṛṅgāra, is mediated by Adbhuta which is contradictory to neither, being represented in the surprise expressed by the hero on hearing the charming song and music too[2].

In case of Vibhāvas and Vyabhicārīs also the contradiction can be removed in the manner as explained above with reference to Rasa.

The authors of the ND appear to be considerably indebted to the Dhvanyāloka where we find a systematic treatment of this topic for the first time.

Flaws (Doṣas) of Rasas

The above discussion implies that the first flaw in the depiction of sentiment which is regarded as the very quintessence of drama by Indian theorists is to represent the contradictory sentiments simultaneously. Here there are other noteworthy flaws which a dramatist must scrupulously avoid. They are as under :-

(1) *Impropriety*

It is of various kinds :

(a) *Introducing the Vibhāvas of a contradictory (or unfriendly) Rasa*, e. g , "Abandon pride. Enough of quarrels, Youth once passed will never return."-being thus exhorted by the cuckoo birds, the young ladies indulge themselves in amorous sports. Here the fickleness of youth is the Vibhāva of Śānta which is unfriendly to Śṛṅgāra[3].

(b) *Untimely representation*, e. g., in the Veṇī. in the time of war which caused the destruction of lacs of heroes along with Bhīṣma and others, the love-scene between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī is represented.

In fact under this martial situation of the play a love-scene has no scope. But Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa-has committed a great artistic blunder while slavishly trying to follow the dramaturgic rules[4].

1. Nāg. I, 5.
2. Ibid. I, 14.
3. The verse quoted is from the Raghuvaṁśa (IX, 47) of Kālidāsa. Critics do not spare even the greatest of poets. But here it is possible to defend Kālidāsa. What the lover wants to argue is this. As youth is so very evanescent every moment is highly precious. One cannot afford to waste it. So the purpose is not to create Vairāgya but to induce the beloved to enjoy to the full every second of life.
4. This scene is severely criticized by almost all writers on poetics; Cf. Dhv. p. 292. The ND seems to have drawn upon the Dhv. here.

(c) *Cutting off (the prevailing sentiment) all of a sudden*, e. g., in the Mahāvīracarita when the heroic sentiment has fully developed by the exchange of hot speeches between Rāma and Paraśurāma, the former suddenly bursts out, "I am going to untie the marriage-string."

(d) *Misrepresenting the nature and temperament of high, middle and low characters*. This can be of various types:-

(i) The comic, tragic, terrible and marvellous sentiments are quite unsuitable to high characters and so are decent love, furious and calm sentiments to the middle and low characters.

(ii) Delineation of love in union in the case of divine, high characters as in the case of Pārvatī and Śaṅkara in the Kumārasaṁbhava (Canto VIII), which is intolerable like the depiction of amorous sports of one's own parents.

(iii) Depiction of anger bearing immediate result, going to heaven or nether region, crossing of ocean etc. in case of non-divine high characters while delineating the heroic sentiment.

(iv) Depiction of sentiments quite contrary to the nature in case of the four types of heroes

(v) Exuberance of heroism etc. in the case of middle and low characters.

(e) *Inappropriateness of language*. The words should be appropriate to and in keeping with the emotion or sentiment to be conveyed. For instance, in the case of vigorous (Dīpta) sentiments like Vīra and Raudra harsh consonants such as ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh, v, or conjuncts should be abundantly used. Moreover, there ought to be long compounds. In case of delicate sentiments like Śṛṅgāra, Karuṇa, etc., the words should be soft. The dramatist should also avoid long compounds. In either case the words should be well-known, unambiguous, refined, and endowed with grace.

(f) *Improper behaviour* such as a fault or fraud committed by a high-born lady, or the hero getting irritated on being kicked by the heroine.

(g) *Action which is incompatible with the age or dress, time and clime, state or stage.*

(h) When *figures of words* such as Yamaka, Śleṣa, etc. predominate or *detailed descriptions* of natural phenomena, seasons, ocean, sun-rise, are given, they hinder the development of the sentiment proper.

(3) If a subordinate thing which is, in fact, meant to develop the main sentiment is described again and again it becomes a fault, e. g., in

the KTR Rāma's weeping over and over again at the news of Jaṭāyu's death, Lakṣmaṇa's injury caused by the missile and Sītā's distress carry pathos too far. A subordinate sentiment ought not to be raised so high lest it should overshadow the principal one.

Here the ND criticizes the opinion of 'some' who illustrate this by the description of Hayagrīva in the Hayagrīvavadha. But according to the ND this is a fault not of Rasa but of the plot itself as the hero of the plot is not delineated in detail. There the heroic sentiment is developed specially by the description of the prowess and pomp of the victim (Vadhya)[1].

(3) Not carrying the dominant sentiment to a high pitch. Here the sentiment which deserves development is not so developed.

(4) The development of a sentiment again and again even when it has already reached its acme is reckoned to be another fault, e. g., lamentation of Rati in the Kumārasaṁbhava (Canto IV). If a sentiment which has been fully developed is touched again and again it fades and loses its charm like a withered garland of Mālatī flowers

(5) Now in a play which includes a number of sentiments, the main sentiment should be connected or linked every time when it is interrupted by other sentiments. This linking is the essence of the development of Rasa. It should be remembered or brought to mind again and again, otherwise it will remain undeveloped and cause a serious flaw, e. g., in the RTN Sāgarikā is totally forgotten on account of the entry of Bābhravya.

The ND at the close of the discussion points out that all of the above-mentioned flaws in fact, can be included under impropriety but they are treated separately, with a view to elucidating by way of illustration as to how many types of improprieties are possible.

The ND then criticizes the view of some who hold that the Vyabhicārīs, Rasas, and Sthāyīs should not be mentioned by name. Their verbal mention is a flaw in Rasa[2]. But this is not correct, says

1. Clearly enough the ND has criticized here the author of the KP (This criticism is equally applicable to the KS which almost literally follows Mammaṭa, p. 171).

2. The view referred to here seems again to have been directed against the KP of Mammaṭa. In the enumeration of Rasadoṣas in Ch. 7 (p. 434) of the KP this one tops the list. Mammaṭa takes this as a fault, of course he points out that it may not be so in all cases. When a particular gesture (Anubhāva) is incapable of suggesting only one specific state of mind then the Vyabhicārī may be mentioned in order that there should not be a shadow of doubt as to the emotion to be conveyed, e. g., haste (Tvarā) may be caused by eagerness and fear as well which are Vya-

the ND. Vyabhicāris and others even though mentioned verbally may develop the dominant state (and ultimately Rasa), e. g., 'The eyes of that proud lady became eager when the lover was far, tremulous as he approached nearer, expanded as he talked, reddish as he embraced, with the brow slightly bent as he caught hold of her garments, full of tears when he bowed at her feet and sharp as the lover committed an offence'[1].

Here there is no Rasadoṣa but there is no strikingness or Vakrokti.

Similarly at times the Vibhāvas mentioned are common to two sentiments and consequently it is difficult to make sure as to which of the two is intended by the poet. This type of dubious apprehension or lack of perspicuity is a fault not of the Rasa but of the construction or expression. The illustration is -

'He (or she) does not relish any thing, his intellect has faded, commits faults (or stumbles at every step), rolls in the bed at night. Thus his body has forcibly fallen in a sad state. What can we do here?'[2]

Here detachment from all objects etc. are possible in case of Karuṇa also and thus there is a doubtful state about Śṛṅgāra being the chief sentiment. This according to the ND is a fault of expression.

This discussion of Rasadoṣas is mainly based on the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana upon whom most of the later writers on poetics draw in the treatment of this and some other topics.

Bhāva

After the discussion of Rasa the authors of the ND turn to Bhāva. Bhāvas are of two types :-

(i) Sthāyi bhāvas.

(ii) Vyabhicāribhāvas. The ND firstly treats of Sthāyibhāvas i. e., dominant states. They are nine in number corresponding to the nine Rasas; (i) Rati (Love), (ii) Hāsa (Humour), (iii) Śoka (Sorrow), (iv) Krodha (anger), (v) Utsāha (vigour), (vi) Bhaya (terror), (vii) Jugupsā (hatred) (viii) Vismaya (wonder) and (ix) Śama (tranquillity)[3].

bhicāris. It will not be a fault even if the Vyabhicāri which is the cause of this haste is mentioned. It may be noted here that the KS too has followed the KP here and points out that verbal mention of Rasa, Bhāva, etc is a fault but at times a similar mention of Vyabhicāris may not be faulty (pp. 159-61) and illustrates it by this very verse.

1. ND, pp. 175-6
2. This again is mentioned by the KP as a Rasadoṣa (KS follows it) where Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas do not clearly suggest one sentiment. The same illustration is cited (p. 264). Thus the attack seems to be directed against Mammaṭa.
3. The order very strictly corresponds to the NS of Bharata (cf. NS VI, 18) with the difference that while the NS mentions eight, the ND adds Śama as the ninth.

Rati consists in mutual attachment between a man and a woman. This attachment or affection is totally distinct from the one to be found in a wanton woman who is prompted merely by passion and her sole interest is the fulfilment of lust. It is also distinguished from the love or regard towards the good, elders, kinsmen, etc., or the attachment towards attractive things. Hāsa is the feeling of joy. The feeling of Śoka consists of pain mingled with dejection. Utsāha is spiritedness or non-slothfulness in the religious activities, alms-giving, fighting etc. Bhaya implies confusion (Vaiklavya). Jugupsā is aversion or disgust. Vismaya is the emotion produced by seeing or hearing of anything surprising. Śama consists in desirelessness. These dominant states are the causes (Pariṇāmikāraṇa) for the rise of their corresponding sentiments. In the cases of other sentiments these Sthāyis serve as transitory states of consequents (Anubhāva), for as soon as they become momentary they lose their Sthāyitva. If they come as accompanying states or helping ones they are transitory. If they come as effects they are consequents (Anubhāvas). Their transitory states and the consequents are the same as those of their respective sentiments.

It is rather strange to find that the ND should treat this important topic so summarily. While Bharata devotes considerable space to this topic the ND disposes of that treatment in a small paragraph in the commentary. The Kārikā 126 simply enumerates them but does not explain them at all. Even in the commentary they are explained in a short sentence at times in a word[1].

Here again a question may arise, "Why then is this distinction of Sthāyī and Vyabhicārī ? Can the Vyabhicārins also be Sthāyīs ?" The answer is in the negative. It is true that both Sthāyīs as well as Vyabhicārins are Bhāvas, i e., mental states. But all these states are not capable of being permanent ones in literature. Dream, sleep, jealousy, sickness etc, are bound to be momentary. They cannot be raised to a high level of Sthāyī. So the ancient poeticians, taking into consideration the poetic and psychological factors, selected only a few out of the big number-just eight or nine-which could be developed into Rasa.

Vyabhicāri Bhāvas

The ND then turns to transitory states (Vyabhicāri or Sañcāri Bhāvas). They are thirty three in number. They are as under :-

1. Nirveda, 2. Glāni, 3. Apasmāra, 4. Śaṅkā, 5. Asūyā, 6. Mada, 7. Śrama, 8. Cintā, 9. Cāpala, 10. Āvega 11. Mati, 21. Vyādhi, 13. Smṛti,

1. Cf. ND-Vaiklavyaṁ bhayaṁ, niḥspṛhatvaṁ śamaḥ......p. 176.

15. Amarśa, 16. Maraṇa, 17. Moha, 18. Nidrā, 19. Supta, 20. Augryā, 21. Hṛṣṭi, 22. Viṣāda, 23. Unmāda, 24. Dainya, 25. Vrīḍā, 26, Trāsa, 27. Tarka or Vitarkaṇa, 28. Garva, 29. Autsukya, 30. Avahitthā, 31. Jāḍya, 32. Ālasya, 33. Vibodhana.

But this list is not exhaustive. There can be even more transitory states such as - Kṣudh (hunger), Tṛṣṇā (thirst), Maitrī (friendship), Muditā (mirth), Śraddhā (faith), Dayā (compassion), Upekṣā (indifference), Arati (hatred), Santoṣa (contentment), Kṣamā (patience) Mārdava (tenderness), Ārjava (straightforwardness), Dākṣiṇya (courtesy), etc. Moreover, even the Sthāyī Bhāvas and Anubhāvas may occur as Vyabhicārīs.

They should be used with propriety. Some of them are common to more sentiments than one, while others are not.

The authors of the ND appear to be quite correct when they say that Vyabhicārī Bhāvas are not thirty three only but that they can be many more.

The ND then goes to define each of the above-mentioned Bhāvas -

1. Nirveda (Discouragement) is disinterestedness or dissatisfaction caused by affliction such as poverty, disease, insult, jealousy, beating, separation from the beloved, etc.[1] This causes mental agony and sighs. This is not invariably fixed for a particular sentiment and is to be occasionally employed and so is called a transitory state and not a dominant one. The same is the case with the remaining states too.

The ND here criticizes Mammaṭa who considers this as Sthāyi Bhāva of Śānta on the ground that, though inauspicious, it has been put first in the list of Vyabhicārīs by Bharata and thereby asserts that it is a Sthāyī[2]. The ND finds here a self-contradiction

Of course the argument of Mammaṭa, though ingenious, cannot be called to be really intended by Bharata. It is clear that Bharata neither recognizes Śānta nor defines it[3]. Had Bharata intended Nirveda to be a Sthāyī of a new sentiment he should have clearly stated it. It is difficult to understand why Bharata should put it in the list of Vyabhicārins, if he really thought it to be a Sthāyī.

Still however the way in which the ND has argued does not seem to be quite fair to Mammaṭa. Mammaṭa is aware of the transitory nature of

1. Literally adopted from the NS (GOS) Vol I, p. 357.
2. Cf. Nirvedasya amaṅgalaprāyasya prathamam anupādeyatve 'pyupādānaṁ vyabhicāritve 'pi sthāyitābhidhānārthaṁ—KP, p. 116.
3. Vide Comparative Aesthetics, vol. I, pp. 178-185.

Nirveda. What he means to say is simply this. When a list is given, the one which is the most important or auspicious among all the members should naturally top the list (Just as Rati, Śṛṅgāra, etc. top the list of Sthāyibhāvas, Rasas, etc.). Why then should Nirveda, which is really inauspicious in sense, be placed first in the list of the Vyabhicāris ? Mammaṭa believes that probably Bharata wants to attach more importance to it as it can be a Sthāyī of the ninth Rasa viz. Śānta.

2. *Glāni* (weakness) consists of agony, both mental as well as physical, caused by diseases, vomitting, hunger, thirst, etc. or by disability due to labour, journey, love-sport, old age etc.

3. *Apasmāra* (Epilepsy) is the loss of discrimination as to what is fit to be done and what is not. It is caused by the influence of some evil spirit or some evil place.

4. *Śaṅkā* (apprehension) is the confused fickle state of mind on account of the misdeed done by one's own self or by others.

5. *Asūyā* (Jealousy) is the feeling of intolerence of others' good qualities or virtues.

6. *Mada* (infatuation) is the joy as a result of intoxication.

If a character enters intoxicated, the intoxication should be removed by terrifying it otherwise there would be chaos (Kāryavyāghāta).

7. *Śrama* (weariness or fatigue) is the exhaustion of the limbs on account of sexual enjoyments, a long journey, physical exercise, etc.

8. *Cintā* (anxiety) is mental affliction on account of not obtaining the desired object or obtaining the undesirable object.

9. *Cāpala* (rashness) (or inconsistency-Haas) is the feeling of venture on account of love, hatred, stupidity or dullness.

10. *Āvega* - (agitation) is the feeling of agitation at the unexpected advent of the desired object.

11. *Mati* (apprehension) is the talents (Pratibhā) as a result of the study of scientific treatises, which destroys false cognition or doubts.

12. *Vyādhi* (sickness) is the feeling of physical and mental pain on account of the disorder of the three humours of the body.

13. *Smṛti* (recollection) is the memory of the thing previously seen or apprehended, as a result of similarity of the thing recently observed[1].

14. *Dhṛti* (contentment) is the feeling of satisfaction on account of knowledge, learning, attainment of the desired object, observance of purity, devotion to gods, special power, etc.

1. This Bhāva very much resembles the figure of speech called Smaraṇa.

15. *Amarṣa* (Indignation) is the desire to wrong a person who committed offence by insulting, showing contempt, etc. It constitutes a desire to pay one back in one's own coin and thus differs from Krodha which is possible even when there is no wrong done by the opposite party[1].

16. *Maraṇa* (Demise) consists of the determination of death as a result of diseases such as disorder of the three humours of the body, fever, itch (or scab), boils,[2] the wound caused by weapons, drinking of poison, snake-bite, attack by wild animals or an elephant or a horse, falling down from a carriage or a lofty place, etc. The person loses all hopes for survival as he considers the evil to be irresistible.

Here actual death that is departure of soul from the body should not be staged.

It is to be noted here that the word Maraṇa does not indicate death proper, for which the word actually stands, as actual death was forbidden on the stage.[3]

17. *Moha* (Distraction) is the loss of senses as a result of a blow on a vital part of the body, unbearable pain, irresistible attack by a thief, a king, a snake, a tiger, etc., revolution in the country, danger of fire or water, seeing (or hearing about) the foes.

18. *Nidrā* (drowsiness) consists of inactivity of sense—organs as a result of fatigue, slothfulness, feebleness, waking at night, over-eating, intoxication, worrs, drowsiness, etc.

19. *Supta* (sleep) it is a higher stage of Nidrā. In the latter only sense-organs become inactive and not the mind but here even the mind slightly ceases to function. The Vibhāvas are the same as in Nidrā.

20. *Augrya* (cruelty) is becoming merciless towards a wicked man who is cruel, untruthful, deceitful.

21. *Harṣa* (Joy) is the mental delight caused by the obtainment of the agreeable thing (or beloved person). It implies abstinence from inagreeable things.

---

1. Vide ND, p. 180.

2. This itch and boil ought to be of a very serious nature. Otherwise they cannot cause death. But at least the person suffering from them prefers death to unbearable suffering.

3. Here we find an improvement upon Bharata who takes Maraṇa as actual death and gives two types of it : (i) caused by disease and (ii) caused by a blow or striking. The DR (IV, 21) remarks that Maraṇa is not discussed as it is well-known and inauspicious. Hemacandra also takes the word as a stage prior to death (Mṛteḥ prāgavasthā mṛtiḥ – KS, p. 143.)

22. *Viṣāda* (despair) consists of mental agony and dejection as a result of not obtaining the desired object or obtaining just the reverse.

23. *Unmāda* (insanity) is the feeling of mental perplexity and unsteadiness as a result of evil spirit, disorder of the three humours of the human body, etc.

This comes as a transitory state of Vipralaṁbha (love in separation) in the case of a high-born character. In case the character is low, it figures as a Vyabhicārī of Karuṇa.

The ND tries to bring out the distinction between Unmāda and Apasmāra. The latter figures in Bībhatsa or Bhayānaka only. While the former implies just the unsteadiness of mind the latter signifies the non-existence or incompetence of the brain.

24. *Dainya* - (depression) is the feeling of mental feebleness (inferiority-complex) which is due to the hard times, poverty, contempt of others, etc.

25. *Vrīḍā* - (shame) is lack of boldness before the elderly persons on account of remorse for unworthy deeds.

26. *Trāsa* (fright) is a dreadful surprise at the terrific sight such as a hurricane or a fall of lightning, or seeing of a ghost etc.

This is to be clearly differentiated from Bhaya where there is a loss of spirits owing to the anticipation of some evil.

27. *Tarka* (deliberation or surmise) is the decision of one matter in the case of differences, doubts, etc.

28. *Garva* (pride or insolence) is a feeling of over-estimating one's own self accompanied by contempt towards others as a result of one's high clan, family, achievement, intellect, power, etc.

It will not be difficult to see that this feeling of pride is just contradictory to the one mentioned before, viz, Dainya. In terms of psychology we may call it superiority-complex.

29. *Autsukya* (Impatience) is the eagerness or longing to see the beloved caused by recollection, desire to see or embrace etc.

30. *Avahitthā* (Dissimulation) is veiling or concealing one's mental disturbances or outward manifestations like knitting of the eye brows, reddening of the face, etc. This concealment may be due to boldness, fear, bashfulness, dignity or crookedness.

31. *Jāḍya* - (Stupor) is the inability to determine as to what one should do as a result of seeing or hearing of a desired object or an undesired one.

This is different from Apasmāra and Moha which represent high excitement (loss of discrimination) and total loss of senses respectively.

32. *Ālasya* (slothfulness) is lack of enthusiasm in doing a thing as a result of fatigue, satiety (Sauhitya), nature (or temperament), disease, pregnancy, etc. This is to be shown chiefly in the case of ladies and low characters.

Here Śrama or fatigue which itself is a Vyabhicārī becomes a Vibhāva of Ālasya. But there is nothing wrong in this. Such a relation of cause and effect between Vyabhicārīs is quite possible. Similarly a Vyabhicārī can also come as an Anubhāva of the other. Of course, one Vyabhicārī cannot come as a Vyabhicārī of the other because in that case that one will go up to the level of a Sthāyī.

33. *Vibodha* (waking) is interruption in slumber on account of some sound (or noise), touch, dream etc.

These Vyabhicāri Bhāvas are temporary or short-lived as compared to the Sthāyi Bhāvas which are permanent or long-lived. They come and go like the pictures of the cinematograph. They are meant to help the development of the dominant state.

The enumeration and the explanation of the thirty three Vyabhicārīs is in keeping with the NS of Bharata. All the theorists have usually followed the same.

The ND turns now to Anubhāvas. They are the effects (Kārya) of the (Rasas), or Sthāyibhāvas or Vyabhicāri bhāvas or other Anubhāvas.

They are as under :-

1. *Vepathu* (tremor) is the quivering of the limbs (or body) on account of fear, disease, joy, cold, anger, touch of the beloved, etc.

2. *Stambha* (Paralysis) is paralysing (becoming motionless) of the limbs on account of excessive joy, surprise, dread, intoxication, disease, etc.

3. *Romāñca* (horripilation). It is called Romāñca when the hair stand erect on account of the sight of the beloved, disease, cold, anger, etc.

4. *Svarabheda* (change of voice) is the change of voice owing to intoxication, fear, joy, anger, love, old age, etc.

5. *Aśru* (tears) is shedding of tears on account of sorrow, looking intently at one object, fury, smoke, applying of collyrium, yawning, terror, pain, laughter, etc.

6. *Mūrchana* (swoon) is losing control over one's senses (i. e. fainting), on account of heavy beating, anger, intoxication, etc.

7. *Sveda* (perspiration) is the excretion of liquid from the body on account of exertion, terror, joy, shame, disease, affliction, heat, etc. It is represented by holding a fan in one's hand, desire for breeze, etc.

8. *Vaivarṇya* (paleness) is loss of one's lustre on account of condemnation, agony, terror, wrath, disease, cold, exertion, etc. It is represented by looking in the directions, pricking one's nails, blushing, etc.

There are thousands of Anubhāvas such as tranquillity, breathing a sigh of relief or pain, crying, lamenting, scratching the ground, turning on the other side, throwing side-long glances, looking downward, admiration, laughter, giving alms, flattery, reddening of the face, etc.[1]

Bharata (and the later theorists) calls these 'Sāttvika Bhāvas'[2]. They are so called because these are caused by the concentration of mind. They cannot be imitated by an absent-minded person. They require great attention and care on the part of an actor. They, in fact, are not actual mental states but are the external manifestations of the same. Hence it would be more correct to call them Anubhāvas or consequents of mental states rather than Bhāvas or states. Bharata also seems to be aware of this particular nature of the so-called Sāttvika Bhāvas and that is why he difines 'Sattva' not as 'mind' but as arising out of the mind[3] or mental concentration.

The DR also follows Bharata but understands this dual nature of these Bhāvas[4]. Dhanika, following Bharata, tries to explain that they are Bhāvas because they are born of mind. But the explanation does not seem to be so convincing. Here there is an attempt to defend Bharata. The ND refuses to accept Bharata (or the authority of the DR and others) and boldly puts them in the category of the Anubhāvas.

It appears that the authors of the ND are perfectly justified here as these eight are of the nature of consequents and not states. We can differentiate them from other consequents which are innumerable, as the ND points out, by calling them Sāttvika Anubhāvas since the representation of these Anubhāvas requires a very high type of mental concentration.

ABHINAYA

Drama is primarily a mimetic art. It is defined as 'mode of imitation'[5] and in order that the imitation may be realistic, histrionic art

1. ND, p. 186.
2. NS (KM), pp. 129–31
3. Vide – Iha hi satvaṁ nāma manaḥprabhavaṁ – NS (KM) p. 129.
4. Cf. pṛthag bhāvāḥ bhavanty anye 'nubhāvatve 'pi sāttvikāḥ – DR IV, 4.
5. Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, p. 1.

or gesticulation becomes absolutely essential. Thus drama is basically histrionic art and a treatise on dramaturgy would be called incomplete if it does not discuss this very important element of drama.

After discussing the sentiments and states the ND turns to Abhinaya. Abhinaya is derived from the root Nī 'to lead' with the prefix 'Abhi' meaning 'towards' or 'near', so called because it leads the Artha or sense towards the spectators The ND takes 'Abhi' in the sense of vividly (graphically or picturously). So Abhinaya conveys the sense very graphically to the spectators[1].

Abhinaya is of four types:

1. Vācika, 2. Āṅgika, 3. Sātvika, 4. Āhārya.

1. *Vācika* - (verbal) is so called because its burden is to imitate speech. Drama is intimately associated with speech. The actor is supposed to imitate the speech of the character in keeping with the sentiment or state to be conveyed. While representing the heroic or the furious sentiment the speech should be vigorous. It ought to be mild and soft if the sentiment is Śṛngāra and so on. Thus speech should convey properly the different states such as anger, pride, etc. or shivering, horripilation, etc. and that is why the playwright often puts some stage-direction such as "angrily", "with agitation" etc. If the speech is imitated without any Bhāva, it is merely recitation and not Vācika Abhinaya.

Here the ND touches a subtle problem connected with the concept of Abhinaya. Is it really possible for the actor to imitate the mental or physical conditions of a person, say Rāma, who lived before centuries and whom he has not seen personally? Even the spectators have not seen Rāma in person and so cannot assert whether or not an actor is truly representing the states of Rāma. So the imitation in this respect cannot be real. The actor, on account of the intense study of the life of Rāma depicted by the dramatist and continuous practice, feels as if he has personally seen Rāma and imitates him. In fact, he imitates the ways of the world. The spectators superimpose the actual Rāma upon the actor being deceived, as it were, by the realistic and life-like four-fold Abhinaya of the actor, and being spell-bound by highly attractive music and hearing the conventional usage of the names Rāma, Sītā, etc. with reference to the actor or the actress and they feel one with the pleasant or painful conditions of the characters.

The spectators superimpose Rāma and others upon the actor irrespective of the fact whether they have seen Rāma or not; otherwise they

1. ND p. 188.

would feel that all this is artificial and would not be able to be one with the states of Rāma and others. Drama thus creates a world of illusion, nevertheless it is possible to enjoy Rasa even out of illusion, e. g., a man experiences Rasa even if he sees a damsel, an enemy or a thief even in dream (which is really untrue); otherwise how could the consequents of Rasas, such as Stambha and others be seen in such cases?

The ND here points out that the poets describe the life of Rāma as visualised by the great seers (Ṛṣis) by their extra-ordinary power of omniscience[1] and so what the poet describes is not false but perfectly true, more true than what is seen by one's own naked eye.

In fact the poet's business is not to depict the historical truth. He is not a historian. From history he borrows merely the names of the characters and certain incidents or episodes connected with them. It is he who has to furnish the lifeless skeleton with flesh and blood and new spirit. His work is not a faithful reproduction but a new creation. As Aristotle puts it, "The poet's function is to describe, not the thing that has happened but a kind of thing that might happen."[2]

2. *Āṅgika* - (Bodily gestures)

It means gesticulation by limbs of the body such as head, hands, breast, waist, sides, feet, eyes, eye-brows, lips, cheeks, chin etc. This bodily action or gesticulation should be such as would convey the emotion such as anger, love, enmity, joy etc[3] And thus there are several types of movements of limbs. Consequently, the movements of the head are of 13 types such as Ākampita, Kampita, etc. There are 36 types of glances and various types of looking[4]. There are many types of eyelid-movements[5]. There are seven types of eye-brow movements[6]. The ND then refers to six types of nose-movements[7], six types of cheek-movements[8], six types of movements of lips (rather lower lip)[9] many types of chin-movements[10], and nine types of neck-movements[11].

1 In fact a poet himself is a seer (cf. kavis tu krāntadraṣṭā). One who does not have a vision of life cannot aspire to earn reputation as great poet.

2. Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, p. 48.

3. For detail refer to NS VIII, 17-38.

4. ibid. 43-110.

5. ibid. 111-118.

6. ibid. 119-129.

7. ibid. 130-136.

8. ibid. 117-140.

9. ibid. 141-146.

10. ibid. 147-152.

11. ibid. 170-175.

3. *Sātvika* – (Tempermental). The gesticulation for which concentration of mind (Sattva) is indispensable is caled Sātvika. This is essential at the time of representing the Sātvika states such as Svarabheda, Stambha, etc. or such actions as emitting foam from the mouth, etc.

This is different from verbal gesticulation as this does not form any speech. Nor this is physical as we do not find a clear and evident movement of limbs.

The ND adds that this is to be represented in keeping with the nature of the character[1] which may be Uttama, Madhyama or Adhama.

4. *Āhārya* – Extraneous representation – (dresses and make-up). This is an imitation of colour (such as white, black, etc.), taste, fragrance, dress, weapons, carriage, etc.

In short, this differs from the earlier three as they were primarily related to body, while Āhārya is different from physical gesticulations as it depends on external objects such as garments, make-up, etc. This is in keeping with the place (region or country), time, family, nature, conditions, sex, etc.

Tho ND does not admit of Citra Abhinaya as it can be included in Āṅgika. Sāmānya Abhinaya too can be included in Vācika etc.

Critical remarks :

After the discussion of Rasa and Bhāva, the ND turns to another important problem of dramaturgy viz., Abhinaya. The ND does not treat this topic at length as does the NS. The latter devotes several chapters[2] to the discussion of gesticulation or histrionic art whose value in a drama can never be over-estimated. Drama is a spectacular form of Poetry (Dṛṣya Kāvya) as against all other forms of poetry which are only to be read or heard (Śravya Kāvya). The success of a drama lies in its successful representation on the stage. Even some of the best dramas fail on the stage. The dramatist has, therefore, to be very vigilant about this aspect of drama and so long as its representation fails to gratify the learned critics the dramatist can never sit at rest[3]. The success of this representation depends mostly upon the actors. Actors are not supposed to repeat the dialogues of a drama in a parrot-like cold way but have to reproduce with appropriate gestures of hands and

1. ND. p. 191.
2. Ch. VIII treats of gestures of minor limbs, Ch. IX of hands, Ch. X of other limbs; Ch. XI, XII, XIII treat of other movements, Ch. XXI treats of Āhārya Abhinaya, Chs. XXII, XXIV, of Sāmānyābhinaya, and Ch. XXV of Citrābhinaya.
3. Cf. Śāk. — Ā paritoṣād viduṣām - I,2.

feet, modulation of voice (in accordance with the emotion to be conveyed) and appropriate expressions on the face, without which the drama will fail to make the emotional appeal to the spectators or give them aesthetic delight (Rasa) which is the 'summum bonum' of drama or any form of literature[1]. Abhinaya is, therefore, a means for creating Rasa. Thus the art of acting forms "the indispensable adjunct of dramaturgy"[2].

This actually is the scope and importance of Abhinaya. But it will easily be seen that it is primarily the concern of the actor and not the dramatist. Nevertheless, the dramatist cannot ignore this aspect. When he writes a play he has always to keep before his mental eye the demands of the stage and that is why he supplies the dialogue with various stage-directions (such as "angrily" "gesticulating shame or love-torment or pity" etc.)

Among these four types of Abhinaya, Vācika is the most important, the others (i.e. Āṅgika, Sātvika and Āhārya) being meant for helping it.

Bharata has devoted two complete chapters[3] on Sāmānyābhinaya which he divides into three types, viz., arising out of speech, physical action and mind and includes therein the qualities or natural characteristics (and types) of the various dramatic personages such as the hero, the heroine, their helpmates, the actor, the stage-manager, etc. The ND does not recognize it independently as that Abhinaya consists in a fusion of two or more of the four Abhinayas.

Bharata has also devoted one chapter[4] to Citrābhinaya which he defines as the occasional peculiarities in the physical and other gestures[5]. But this again, according to the ND, can be included in Āṅgika Abhinaya.

---

1. Cf. Na hi rasād ṛte kaścid arthaḥ pravartate.
2. Encyclopaedia Britanica No. VII, p. 391.
3. NS (KM) XXII, XXIV.
4. NS (KM) XXV.
5. NS (KM) XXV, 1.

CHAPTER IV

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS COMMON TO ALL TYPES OF DRAMA

Chapter IV of the ND deals with miscellaneous topics concerning dramaturgy. It is named Sarvarūpakasādhāraṇalakṣaṇa i. e. a chapter defining and explaining some miscellaneous features which are common to all forms of Rūpakas. After discussing the nature, form, structure and peculiarities of all the Rūpakas the authors here take into consideration miscellaneous things that a playwright ought to be conversant with.

The chapter begins with the discussion of *Nāndī*.

A drama should invariably begin with Nāndī. It consists of blessing or propitiation of a god, a king, an assembly, a master, the goddess of speech (Sarasvatī), the poet, etc. It consists of six or eight *padas*[1].

Nāndī is indispensable. Other Aṅgas of Pūrvaranga such as Utthāpana and others are not so. They may or may not be introduced.

Then the ND quotes Nāndī verses from Bharata's NS by way of an illustration[2]. The four verses in Anuṣṭubh metre quoted here constitute 12 subordinate sentences pronouncing blessings.

The ND points out here that the length of Nāndī differs according to the nature or shape of the theatre. In a triangular theatre the Nāndī can consist of maximum of 12 padas and minimum of 3 padas. In a quadrangular theatre it consists of sixteen padas (at the most) or four 'padas' minimum. This would mean that in a triangular theatre ordinarily it should consist of 6 padas while in the quadrangular one it should consist of 8 padas[3].

The ND then explains the place of Nāndī in Pūrvaraṅga. Nāndī forms an essential part of Pūrvaranga. It is the twelfth out of the nineteen Aṅgas. But all these nineteen are not indispensable. The ND discusses only Nāndī and does not discuss the rest because some of them are too obvious or well-known, some are futile, while some are voluntary (not indispensable)[4]. Nāndī, on the other hand, is indispensable and a

1. The word 'pada' in the definition is ambiguous. Pada may mean a word or a quarter of a stanza. According to some 'pada' does not mean a full sentence but a subordinate sentence or a clause (Avāntara vākya).
2. NS (GOS) V, 110-113.
3. It is not quite clear as to why the length of Nāndī should vary according to the shape of the theatre. There is hardly any causal relation between Nāndī and the shape of the theatre.
4. ND, p. 193, lines 4.

good act should be preceded by some utterance; that is why Nāndī alone is discussed. The poets also at the commencement of the play invariably put the stage-direction viz. "Then enters the stage-manager at the end of Nāndī".

In case the Nāndī by the poet is not found[1] even then the Nāndī by the stage-manager must be performed. The Nāndī is to be recited by the stage-manager and actors.

Critical Observations

Nāndī forms a very important part of Pūrvaraṅga. But here a few points about the conception of the ND regarding the Nāndī and the Pūrvaraṅga of which it forms a part[2] deserve to be noted.

The NS of Bharata gives a detailed treatment of the Pūrvaraṅga (the preliminaries of a play)[3]. These preliminaries are, in fact, so lengthy that they are apt to exhaust the patience of any human being-actors as well as the spectators[4]. Their performance involved practical difficulties. Naturally enough, therefore, slowly and gradually these apparently useless limbs of Pūrvaraṅga began to be dropped one by one.

Bharata himself is not unaware of the tediousness of this lengthy and complicated religious ceremony and lays down that the lengthy pūrvaraṅga-ceremonies may be curtailed so that it may not try the patience of the audience[5]. This practical difficulty Bharata himself might have felt in his own time. This hint of Bharata's NS was taken very seriously by the dramatic companies after the time of Abhinavagupta, and the process of the curtailment or graudal dropping of all the items of Pūrvaraṅga began[6]. In the days of the ND it is quite possible that other Aṅgas of Pūrvaraṅga were not popular and only the Nāndī had survived.

The word Nāndī has been variously explained. It is commonly derived from 'Nand' (to please). It is so called because it pleases gods[7] as it eulogizes them. It pleases the spectators too as it confers blessings upon

1. Here our authors seem to have Bhāsa in their mind whose dramas began with the entry of the Sūtradhāra.
2. The problem has been discussed in detail by Prof. R. B. Athavale in his article "The Problem of Nāndī and Pūrvaraṅga".
3. Vide NS, chapter V.
4. The words like 'Alaṁ ativistareṇa' (i. e. enough of the formalities) clearly point to this.
5. Cf. NS (KM) V, 162-164.
6. R. B. Athavale : The Problem of Nāndī and Pūrvaraṅga.
7. Nandanti devatā asyāṁ iti nāndī.

them[1]. The BP tries to derive it from Nandī, the bull of Lord Śiva,[2] merely on the basis of verbal similarity being permitted by Yāska to do so when it is not possible to do otherwise[3].

DHRUVĀ

After Nāndī, the ND takes up the topic of Dhruvā. Dhruvā here dealt with is the Dhruvā of the poet and is different from Rangadhruvās[4] and Gānadhruvās[5] discussed by the NS of Bharata[6], which form a part of the stage-performance.

Dhruvā is defined as a metrical composition which is fit to be sung and which has strikingness of sense[7] consisting of the various descriptions of lakes, forests, etc., or of day, night, twilight, etc. or of animals, such as an elephant, a horse, a lion, etc. or of some sentiment such as love, pathos, etc. But the sense should be such as would help the relevant plot.

Types of Dhruvā

Dhruvā can be divided mainly into five types -

1. Prāveśikī, 2. Naiskrāmikī, 3 Ākṣepikī, 4. Prāsādikī and 5. Āntarī.

1. *Prāveśikī* - When a particular song ornamented by the figures of speech like Paronomasia (Śleṣa) and speech of brevity (Samāsokti) is sung in keeping with the sentiment, state (Bhāva), nature, condition, etc. of the character that actually enters the stage, that Dhruvā is known as Prāveśikī i. e. having entry as its purpose. The illustration is from the Anargharāghava where the arrival of Viśvāmitra (with a view to taking away Rāma for the sake of protecting his hermitage) is suggested under the pretext of the description of the sunrise[8].

1. Cf. NS V, 24 Āśīrvacana. .etc. The BP too explains it similarly (I, 179).
2. BP, p. 196.
3 Cf. Nirukta ------ अक्षरवर्णसामान्यान्निर्ब्रूयात् ------ । (पृष्ठ-५७)
4 By Rangadhruvās the ND seems to refer to those Dhruvās which were employed in the lengthy Pūrvaranga ceremony where Bharata ordains the use of various Dhruvās (NS, Adhyāya-V)
5. By Gānadhruvās the ND seems to mean those Dhruvās which were introduced merely for the purpose of music, at the time of enacting the play. Dr. V. Raghavan in his article 'Music in Ancient Indian Drama' observes, "In the great classical period, when the prose-verse dramatic master-pieces were produced, stage artists had their own composers who wrote the Dhruvā-music, using the poet's contextual verses for guidance." (The Journal of Madras Music Academy Vol. XXV p. 864.)
6. ND, p. 154.
7. Citrārtha geya rūpaka - ND. IV, 155 Here Rūpaka is taken in a peculiar sense, viz. a metre which has a specific number of syllables. Cf. Rūpakaṁ niyata-mātrākṣaraṁ chandaḥ-ND, p. 195.
8. Vide Anargh. I, 13.

The ND gives another illustration from the Devīcandragupta[1] where the entry of Kumāracandragupta is suggested under the pretext of the moonrise.

2. *Naiskrāmikī* - When a song is introduced with a view to suggesting the exit of a character from the stage for some reason at the end or the middle of an Act, it is known as Naiṣkrāmikī, i. e. having exit as its purpose.

The ND illustrates from the Devī. (Act V) "The moon (Candra) is going to assault the planet in the form of the sky...etc." suggests the going of Candragupta towards the palace.

3. *Ākṣepikī* - This is to be introduced when a new sentiment is brought to rise having subdued the one already present. It suggests the introduction of a sentiment other than the prevailing one, e. g., in the UDR, having brushed aside the sentiment of love, the heroic is introduced by the verse uttered from behind the scenes, "O, you hermit, holt, where are you going now ?" etc.

4. *Prāsādikī* - It is introduced to strengthen a particular Rasa by developing its Vibhāvas, etc. or to inform the audience of the mental state of the character which has entered the stage.

The ND adds here that according to the old tradition this type must be introduced after the introduction of Prāveśikī and Ākṣepikī.

5. *Āntarī* - It is meant to fill up the gap[2]. When there is a shocking news such as the loss of wealth, or when in the case of a violent performance, there is a possibility of the person falling into a swoon or the like, out of fatigue, or the falling down of the garment or an ornament, this is sung in order that the person may get time to recover and that the adverse effect of the unexpected occurrence on the mind of the spectators may be wiped out. This Dhruvā is sung by an actor or an actress from "behind the scenes." It is in keeping with the current sentiment or the coming one.

This five-fold division of Dhruvās cannot be taken very rigorously because there can be other divisions too but they are not so much used. The above-mentioned five divisions are very commonly found in literature and hence only five are mentioned.

Critical Remarks

Dhruvās may be well compared with the lolk-songs. They appear to have evolved from the Vedic metres. Just as Vedic Sanskrit is reckoned

1. Vide ND. p. 194.
2. Antaraṁ chidraṁ tatra bhavā āntarī - ND, p. 195.

to be the origin of the classical Sanskrit as well as Prakrit in the same way Vedic metres may be reckoned to be the origin of the classical metres on the one hand the Dhruvās on the other. These metres were not rigid like the Sanskrit Vṛttas which therefore were not so fit for being sung.

The different types of Dhruvās indicate the different functions that Dhruvās perform in drama. They may be used to suggest the entry or exit of a character. The proper music on the stage behind the scenes is bound to enhence the dramatic effect of the entry or exit of a character. Similarly apt and appropriate music behind the scenes goes a long way in creating a proper psychological mood in the audience to enjoy different Rasas.

The NS XXXII treats exhaustively of the nature of Dhruvā and its various types. Dhruvā has more purposes than one. The NS discusses them in detail. It was employed in Pūrvaraṅga. Pūrvaraṅga was a very elaborate procedure and the author of the NS requires Dhruvās in that procedure at some intervals. Moreover, Dhruvās were specially employed to introduce the element of music in the play. There can be many types of Dhruvās according to their metre and nature.

The Śārṅgadharapaddhati begins the topic of Dhruvās with the verse-" Just as there can be no knowledge without discrimination (Viveka), no meditation without spiritual interest, no alms without faith, in the same way there can be no song without Dhruvaka "[1], and then discusses its sixteen divisions[2]. It appears that these Dhruvās are particular metres governed by the number of syllables or by their quantity (Mātrā) and by the rythme (Tāla).

On a close observation of the works on dramaturgy we find that Dhruvās were mainly connected with song and music[3]. Music plays an important part in drama[4]. Ancient rhetoricians were not ignorant of this magical effect of music and song. From the early times literature was usually meant to be sung, and so we find most of our ancient

1. Śārṅgadharapaddhati, verse No. 1965.
2. Ibid, verses 1976-1995.
3. Prof. D. R. Mankad writes, " In the actual practice of the performance of a drama, there was a musical programme gone through. At the entrance of particular characters in particular scenes, certain songs were sung declaring their entrance. They were called Dhruvās". The Types of Sanskrit Drama, p. 181; also compare Sanskrit Drama, p. 339.
4. Dr. V. Raghavan has elaborately treated of this topic in his article "Music in Ancient Indian Drama".

literature to have been composed in verse[1]. We know thereby how intimate was the relation between song and literature in old days.

Bharata gives a number of such Dhruvās. But Dhruvās of the ND are rather different from those of the NŚ in the sense that Bharata mentions them as forming a part of the elaborate ceremony to be performed before the drama is actually staged (i. e. Pūrvaraṅga) or they are introduced by the stage-manager in the play at his own descretion, while those of the ND form a part of the play proper. The Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa mentions Dhruvā as one of six divisions of Śravya Kāvya[2] and points out that its purpose is the entry of a character or depiction of a sentiment[3].

The use of Dhruvās is mostly found in ancient plays. Rājaśekhara and Murāri too have used them (In the prologue of the Bālabhārata, Rājaśekhara points out that Dhruvās are the very essence or spirit (lit. soul) of Drama). They are songs which serve a triple purpose in the play[4]. Firstly, they reveal a part of the plot. Secondly, they entertain the spectators, and thirdly, they combine the different sentiments. The early origin of Dhruvās is significant. Music and dance have played a very important role in the origin and development of Sanskrit drama. Even today in primitive societies singing and dancing have been the chief means of entertainment. The very fact that our most ancient literary works were in verse also indicates the importance of song.

In the Bālabhārata the meeting of Vasiṣṭha and Vālmīki is suggested by Prāveśikī Dhruvā. The Prakrit verses of the Vikramorvaśīya (Act IV) furnish us with a number of Dhruvās. The song of Haṁsapadikā in the Śāk, Act V, may also be taken as an illustration of Dhruvā

The illustration of Ākṣepikī Dhruvā as given by the ND forms a purely classical Sanskrit metre. It is written in Sanskrit too. Thus it would not be correct to say that Dhruvā should be in Prakrit only. Prakrit might have been usually selected by the poets simply because Prakrit, because of the flexibility of grammar and phonetic variations, its simplicity and sweetness, was more suited to song than classical Sanskrit which is so rigid and bound up by rules of grammar and composition; classical metres also are highly regularised by rigid rules of metrics and so are more fit to be recited than sung.

---

1. Compare the early Sanskrit name for literature, viz , Kāvya (i. e which is fit to be sung). And the poet is known as Kavi – one who sings.
2. Cf. SK II, 140-141,
3. Seyaṁ pātrapraveśarasānusandhānādiprayojanā dhruvā –ibid. p. 307.
4. Dhruvā hi nāṭyasya prathame prāṇāḥ – Bālabhārata (prologue).

The BP discusses the topic of Dhruvās in about twenty verses. Here it is pointed out that the language in which Dhruvās are written is Śauraseni while in the case of divine characters it may be Sanskrit[1].

From the illustrations of the Prāveśikī and other Dhruvās it appears that the Dhruvās are generally symbolical (especially when the entry or exit of a character is to be suggested). Thus in Dhruvās cited by the ND the entry of Viśvāmitra and Candragupta is suggested by the rise of the sun and the moon respectively.

From the above discussion we can come to the following conclusions -

1. Dhruvās were originally particular metres. These metres were governed by the quantity (Mātrā) of syllables or merely by the number of syllables (Akṣara).

2. They were sung.

3. They were employed at different places with various purposes -

(a) They were employed in the religious ceremony called Pūrvaraṅga.

(b) They were at times introduced in a play merely with a view to creating a musical effect.

(c) They were introduced with the dramatic purpose of helping the plot-development.

4. They were usually in Prakrit especially when the purpose was to create a musical effect[2].

Still however, there is no specific rule as there have been Dhruvās in Sanskrit too[3].

While discussing the relation between Greek and Sanskrit drama Prof. K. B. Dhruva remarks that the Dhruvās have something in common with the chorus in ancient Greek drama which was used to develop action and join the different parts of the plot, the essential difference being only this: 'Greek chorus was related to the plot while Dhruvās were to the hero'[4].

---

1. BP, p. 303, lines 17-18.

2. This is further corroborated by the fact that Dhruvās seem to have developed in provincial languages. In this connection it may be noted that the word Dhruvaka or Dhruvapada in Gujarati seems to have been derived from Dhruvā The term Dhruvaka is used for a line which is to be repeated every now and then in a song (usually a folk-song).

3. Vide the illustration of Ākṣepikī Dhruvā as given by the ND (p. 194).

4. Cf. Sāhitya ane Vivecana, Part I (in Gujarati), pp 103-6.

But if we look to the various types of Dhruvās there is nothing to prove that Dhruvās must be related to the hero only, even though a large majority of Dhruvās that we find in Sanskrit dramas to have a direct or indirect relation with the hero.[1]

Types of characters in a play

After the discussion of Nāndī and Dhruvā, the ND turns to one of the most important elements of Drama, viz., characters. In a typically Indian manner a detailed classification of characters is given. This classification is made from different angles. The first is the classification on the basis of *sex* according to which characters are primarily of two types:

(i) Men characters and (ii) Women characters.

On the basis of their *qualities* each of these can be subdivided into :-

(i) High or Uttama.

(ii) Middling or Madhyama.

(iii) Lower or Nīca.

(i) The male with excellent character (Uttama) possesses the following qualities: He is a protector of the refugee, courtious, sacrificing, well-versed in the ways of the world and all sciences, possessed of poise, courage, sense of honour and justice.

(ii) The male of the middle type has all these qualities in a mediocre degree.

(iii) The male of the lower type is sinful, slanderous, slothful, ungrateful, quarrelsome, impotent, greedy of women, harsh-tongued and a dullard.

Similarly, a woman with an excellent character has the following virtues: She is bashful, tender, calm, serene, gay, modest, born of a high and noble family, skilful, and affectionate. The remaining two types of female characters are not discussed but they resemble the corresponding types of males. That is to say, the middling one will have the above qualities to a mediocre extent and the lower woman will have all the vices belonging to a male of the lower type.

The authors of the ND give another classification of character on the basis of their *nature or temperament* as compared to their age and state -

i. Appropriate.
ii. Inappropriate.
iii. Befitting the role.

1. Vide Dhruvās of Vikram. or Śāk.

The appropriate indicates apt mental condition looking to the age, position, sex, etc. of a character. A male character must exhibit masculine qualities while a female must have feminine grace. Inappropriate variety will occur when an old man exhibits childishness and vice versa. The last variety will include a state when a male will show womanliness when he has taken the part of a woman and vice versa[1].

Qualities of a hero

Usually the hero must be of the high (Uttama) type but occasionally even a low one can figure as a hero as in Bhāṇa and Prahasana where the chief purpose is to provoke laughter and ridicule. They are an exception to the general rule that only a high or a middle (as in Prakaraṇa) character can stand as the hero

The ND now defines the hero and explains his qualities -

The hero is one who achieves the fruit and never suffers a catastrophe. He must possess the following inborn qualities at least -

i. *Tejas* is the sense of honour which shall retaliate any kind of insult or offence even at the cost of one's life.

ii. *Vilāsa* is vivacity which implies a firm step and a firm glance and a laughing voice.

iii. *Mādhurya* is the grace manifested in the display of but slight change of demeanour in trying circumstances.

iv. *Śobhā* indicates brilliance at the time of showing competition, heroism, etc.

v. *Sthairya* - is steadfastness in accomplishing one's objects inspite of the impediments or misfortunes.

vi. *Gāmbhīrya* - is impassivity or superiority to emotion even at the time of great mental agitation.

vii. *Audārya* - is the nobility exhibited in sacrificing one's own life for the sake of the good.

1. The above classification may be represented in a tabular form as under :-

viii. *Lalita* - or sportiveness includes the natural innocent expressions of love such as side-long glances, striking speeches, self-decoration, etc.

Critical observations

Characters form an important part of drama. The dramatic development of the plot is possible through characters only. Thus the treatment of this topic becomes necessary in a treatise on dramaturgy. The characters have been usually divided into (i) High, (ii) Middle and (iii) Low. There is another type of division given by the ND on the basis of the nature of the characters into (i) Anurūpa, (ii) Virūpa and (iii) Rūpānurūpin.

The eight qualities of a hero are in accordance with the NS and the DR. Materially there is no change in the definitions of the qualities too. Only the wording is slightly different. The NS (Ch. XXII) treats of the topic at full length. The DR in the beginning of Chapter II treats of the qualities of a hero. The DR is more informative and exhaustive in the treatment of the topic.

The DR illustrates each quality in the commentary by Dhanika but the ND does not think it necessary to do so probably because in that case the work would be unnecessarily lengthy. The topic is also simple and requires little of explanation.

The Hero of the Patākā or the Prakari

After the discussion of the hero, the authors of the ND discuss very briefly the nature of the hero of the Patākā or the Prakarī, i. e., the hero of the sub-plot (Gauṇa nāyaka). He is a companion to the hero and is not directly concerned with the achievement of the main fruit. He is concerned with the fruit of the sub-plot. He is depicted to be inferior in qualities to the hero, so that the personality of the hero may not be overshadowed by him.

Pratināyaka

He is the opponent or the enemy of the hero. He is avaricious, stubborn, criminal, vicious, and ultimately meets with disaster. He corresponds to the villain of a modern drama. His object is to create obstacles in the path of the hero. In the story of Rāma, Rāvaṇa works as Pratināyaka against Rāma. Duryodhana may be looked upon as a Pratināyaka against (the Pāṇḍavas or) Yudhiṣṭhira.

The Pratināyaka should have the qualities opposite to the hero. He symbolizes the wicked (or devilish) elements trying to harass the good and virtuous. But ultimately truth becomes triumphant.

Low characters in drama

The authors of the ND now turn to the low characters such as the Vidūṣaka, eunuchs, the Śakāra, the Viṭa and attendants.

The Śakāra is the brother-in-law of the king. He is the brother of the royal concubine who is of low caste[1]. He is meant to produce humour.

The Viṭa is the knower of any one[2] of the fine arts such as singing, etc. which would entertain the king. The word is derived from the root 'vid' to know. The word will thus mean 'one who knows' i. e. cultured. He is 'a perfect man of the world with literary and artistic culture to boot.'

His position in drama is usually subordinate, but in a Bhāṇa he plays a very important part where he describes his adventures or those of others. He usually accompanies a courtesan. In the MṚC he is also related to the Śakāra.

Bharata describes him thus : He is found with gaudy clothes and ornaments. He is easily excited and easily pacified. He speaks Māgadhi Prakrit and belongs to Adhama type of characters.

The character of Śakāra finds a very important place in the MṚC of Śūdraka where he acts as a villain and makes the audience laugh at his stupid speeches and awkward actions. He has earned this title on account of his overuse of 'Śa'.

The Vidūṣaka (Jester)

He holds an important place in the Sanskrit drama. His chief purpose is to produce laughter. It may be produced in three ways (i) by physical deformity such as baldheadedness, crippledness, having long protruding teeth, misshapen face, etc. (ii) odd and unusual dress such as a very long attire (iii) strange and ludicrous speech such as irrelevant, meaningless, vulgar chatter. In short the Vidūsaka is ludicuous in physical appearance, dress and speech.[3]

All the Vidūṣakas are personal friends of the hero. They are of four types (i) an ascetic (ii) a Brahmin (iii) a king's employee and (iv) a pupil. The ascetic type of Vidūṣaka is used when the hero is a god. He is a pupil when the hero is a Brahmin. In the case of the hero being a king or a merchant, he may be any of the three types except the pupil.

1. Bharata refers to Śakāra, Viṭa, etc as low characters. Vide NS (GOS) XXIV, 14; cf. SD III, 46.

2. ND IV, 167. By 'any one' the ND seems to mean 'at least one'; also cf. Ekavidyo viṭaḥ - DR II, p 9.

3. The ND, p. 199; also cf. RS - Vikṛtāṅgavacoveśaiḥ hāsyakārī Vidūṣakaḥ (I, 92)

Here the ND seems to have followed Bharata[1]. But the ND deviates from Bharata in one point, viz., Bharata allows a Brahmin only as the Vidūṣaka of the king[2] while the ND allows any of the three except the pupil. It is likely that this modification by the ND may be based on the observation of the actual dramas even though at present we do not come across any piece of drama where the Vidūṣaka of a king is an ascetic or a king's employee. It is also quite probable that such works are now lost to us.

The ND then gives an interesting etymology of the word Vidūṣaka. The root here is 'dūṣ' (to spoil) with the preposition Vi' which means 'excessively' (Viśeṣena). Vidūṣaka is so called because he spoils (i. e. completely or in a particular (Viśeṣena) manner, peace by conflicts and conflicts by peace in the case of heroes in separation of love and that he causes the separation to be forgotten by affording diversion.

Keith takes the word Vidūṣaka to mean "one given to abuse."[3] Dr. A. N. Upadhye explains the word as "a hyper-Sankritic back-formation of 'Viūso' or 'Viūsao' in Prakrit (with 'Ka'-suffix) which is to be connected with 'Vidvas' in Sanskrit[4]. Dr. G. K. Bhat does not agree with either of these scholors and takes the word to mean "one who has a characteristic mode (Vi) of fault-finding (Dūṣ) with a view to evoking laughter"[5].

The Vidūṣaka is one of the most conventional characters of Sanskrit drama. His humour is quaint and stereotyped. Bharata has described in detail his nature and characteristics such as deformity, stupidity, gluttony, timidity, etc. All the Vidūṣakas in Sanskrit literature share these common characteristics and lack individuality excepting those of the great poets like Kālidāsa and Śūdraka who have tried to infuse some new spirit in this character.

Helpmates of the Hero

A hero should have helpmates. They are the royal prince, the commander-in-chief, priests, ministers, foresters, feudatory princes, ascetics and others. Some help in matters relating to administration of royal affairs (Arthacintā), some others in matters of love, and some others still in matters pertaining to religion.

---

1. Cf. NS (GOS) XXIV, 16-20.
2. NS (GOS) XXIV, 20.
3. Sanskrit Drama, p. 39.
4. Candralekhā (introduction), p. 26.
5. Vidūṣaka, pp. 85-89.

These helpmates are essential for the hero. The success of the hero of the Dhiralalita type rests on his helpmates. The hero of Dhīroddhata type has his success resting on both, himself as well as the helpers.

Attendants of the harem

The authors then discuss the attendants of the harem. They are as under :-

i. *Kāruka* - is an impotent person but is of good conduct and worthy. He works as a door-keeper.

ii. *Kañcukin* - is effeminate and not of condemnable caste.

iii. *Varṣavara* - or eunuchs are impotent, obedient and modest.

iv. *Nirmuṇḍa* - is one who is completely impotent and idle. He is employed to send for women.

v. *Pratihārī* - (door-keeper) has the function of announcing to the king political events.

vi. *Mahattarā* - (duenna) is one who sees to the punctual performance of auspicious rites.

vii. *Vṛddhā* - an old experienced lady who is conversant with the tradition and customs of the earlier kings.

viii. *Śilpakārikā* - (a crafts-woman) is well-versed in painting, shampooing, fanning, and other fine arts.

The Heroine

Heroines are divided into four types on the basis of their *special strata* -

1. *Kulajā* - (high-born).

2. *Paṇyakāminī* - (a harlot).

3. *Divyā* (Divine).

4. *Kṣatriyā*.

A harlot must be depicted love-lorn in all plays (except in Prahasanas which have mere farce for their aim), e. g., Vasantasenā in the MṚC. For the sake of ridicule in the Prahasana the courtesan may not be after the hero.

When the hero is divine or a king the courtesan should not be depicted as the heroine. A divine courtesan, like Urvaśī in the Vikramorvaśīya, however, could be introduced as the heroine.

Moreover, on the basis of their *age and mental state* the heroines may be divided into three types :-

1. *Mugdhā* (Inexperienced) - She is shy in her love (being ignorant about it) and gentle in anger. She is of budding youth and love.

2. *Madhyā* (Partly experienced) - She is full of love of the (rising) youth, and anger. She is conversant with the pleasures of love and permits its indulgences even to the point of fainting. Madhyā again is of three types :- Dhīrā, Adhīrā, and Dhīrādhīrā. Dhīrā (self-controlled) rebukes her erring husband with sarcasm and double entendres. Adhīrā (Uncontrolled) chides her husband with tears, sided by harsh words. Dhīrādhīrā (Partly controlled) rebukes her husband with tears, sarcasm and harsh words with double entendres.

3 *Pragalbhā* (the experienced) - She is well advanced in age, love's anger (Manyu) and love. She is so passionate that she faints at the first embrace (touch).

Just as Madhyā she also is of three types - (i) Dhīrā, (ii) Adhīrā, (iii) Dhīrādhīrā. Dhīrā when angry is pretendedly respectful and is indifferent to the pleasures of love. Adhīrā is wont to scold and strike (uses threats and blows) against her husband. Dhīrādhīrā employs the weapons of raillery and equivoke.

Still from anther point of view, depending upon her *relation to her lover*, the heroine is divided into eight types -

1. *Proṣitapriyā* (or Proṣitabhartṛkā) (a heroine with her lover absent abroad) is one whose husband has gone to some foreign land for earning wealth or such other reason. She does not decorate herself.

2. *Vipralabdhā* - (Deceived heroine) - When the lover d es not turn up even after fixing the appointment at a rendezvous or even when the heroine sends a messenger to call him the heroine is known as Vipralabdhā.

3. *Khaṇḍitā* (enraged heroine) is a lady overpowered by jealousy on finding her lover disfigured by the marks of union with another lady.

The difference between Vipralabdhā and Khaṇḍitā is that in the former the lover is not attached to another lady while here he is.

4. *Kalahāntaritā* - (a heroine separated from her lover by a quarrel) - When the lover has left being tired of the quarrel through jealousy and does not return, the heroine is known as Kalahāntaritā.

This type of heroine, because of the quarrel, is not eager to meet her lover at all, while Khaṇḍitā is anxious for the union and is highly jealous on finding her lover attached to some other lady.

5. *Virahotkaṇṭhitā* - (distressed by her lover's involuntary absence) Here the separation is caused not by the lover's attachment to some

other lady. The heroine gets anxious. There is no quarrel (as in no. 4) nor jealousy as in the case of Khaṇḍitā and so the union with the lover is sure in no time. Thus she differs from other heroines in separation where separation is due to pride, jealousy, etc.

6. *Vāsakasajjā* - (awaiting her lover in full dress). She decorates herself as the lover is going to stay at night and would come at the fixed time. In the earlier types there is love in separation (Vipralaṁbha) while here there is love in union (Sambhoga).

7 *Svādhīnabhartṛkā* - (a heroine having her husband in subjection). The husband is at her beck and call being enamoured of her beauty and youth She feels delighted. She is not different from No. 6 as both have their husbands at hand.

8. *Abhisārikā* - (a heroine moving towards her lover) - She herself goes out to meet the lover or presses him to come to her for the sake of dalliance.

Sanskrit rhetoricians have taken great care and pains in describing very minutely the types and the qualities of the heroines. The NS (KM) XXII 203-212 defines the eight types of heroines and then discusses their dress, behaviour, etc. The DR enters in greater detail and systematically classifies the heroines from various points of view and illustrates each one of them. The later rhetoricians have usually followed the DR and have added several species more. The treatment of this topic finds still more elaboration in the Rasamañjarī of Bhānudatta whose total number of the types of the heroine comes to 1152.[1]

The treatment of the ND is much similar to that of the earlier authorities such as Bharata and Dhanañjaya.

The elaborate classification of the hero and the heroine has led certain critics to think that Sanskrit drama does not represent individuals but types. All the characters here are conventional. But this criticism is not justified. First the classification applies only to the hero and the heroine and not to all the characters in the play where the poet is free to exhibit his skill in effective characterisation. Great poets like Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, and others have skilfully depicted even their minor characters as possessed of distinct individuality. Characters such as Anasūyā and Priyaṁvadā in the Śākuntala, Saṁsthānaka, Darduraka and others in the MṚC, are unforgettable on account of their unique individual personality.

Even the heroes and the heroines, although they belong to a particular

1. Vide Rasamañjarī (Intro.), p. 6 For a comprehensive treatment of this topic vide Dr. Raghavan's introduction to Śṛṅgāramañjarī of Saint Akbar Shah.

type, have their own individual traits, e. g., both Rāma and Duṣyanta, even though both belong to the Dhīrodātta type, have their own distinct personality; so also Sītā and Śakuntalā.

The theory, therefore, puts no restriction on the poet's art of creating individual characters.

The qualities of youthful women

After the discussion of the various types of heroines the authors now proceed on an allied topic of the qualities of youthful ladies. These qualities are divided into three groups :-

1. Physical (Aṅgaja)
2. Natural or inherent (Svabhāvaja.)
3. Involuntary (Ayatnaja) (at the time of sexual enjoyment).

Those qualities are twenty in number. The authors at the same time point out that the number twenty should not be taken to mean that there are only twenty qualities. In fact, there can be innumerable qualities. But here only twenty are mentioned, as they are more important[1].

These qualities are like ornaments such as bangles, bracelets, etc. which decorate a person. These qualities really add charm to the personality of a woman.

These qualities specially belong to young women. They are chiefly in accompaniment with youth. In girlhood they manifest themselves slightly, while in old age they mostly vanish. It is in youth that they are distinctly perceived.

These qualities belong to women only. In men also some of them may be found but they are subsidiary. The chief qualities of males are fortitude (Utsāha), etc. All the four types of heroes are possessed of firmness and courage. So these qualities, viz. Bhāva etc. are suppressed by the strong qualities such as fortitude etc. in males.

The first three of these twenty qualities belong to the first type, viz., physical. They are Bhāva, Hāva and Helā. These arise out of the body only, charming due to the blossoming youth irrespective of the external causes such as lovely sight, dress, garlands, etc.

The next group of ten qualities belongs to the second type, viz., Svābhāvika or innate, related to the very nature (Svabhāva) of the person. They are - Vibhrama, Vilāsa, Vicchitti, Līlā, Vivvoka or (Bibboka), Vihṛta, Lalita, Kuṭṭamita, Moṭṭāyita and Kilikiñcita[2]. They arise out of

1. Cf. ND, p. 204. The SD mentions twenty eight excellences born of Sattva (Sattvaja alaṁkāra) (III, 89-92.)

2. The SD refers to eighteen innate qualities adding Mada, Tapana, Maugdhya, Vikṣepa, Kutūhala, Hasita, Cakita and Keli, to the above group of ten, (III, 106-110).

the personal sentiment of love at the time of enjoyment with the lover[1]. All of these ten qualities are not indispensable as they may arise singly or in a group of two or three or more. These ten together with the above three (Physical) making a total of thirteen, signify activity and the physical gestures of the damsels, while the remaining seven of the third group, i. e. Ayatnaja, automatically arise without any sort of effort at the time of sexual enjoyment So they are different from the earlier thirteen which constitute physical activity which is not possible without deliberation and effort[2].

Now the authors go to define and explain each of them one by one –
(i) *Āṅgika*

1. *Bhāva* (Feeling) is a peculiarity in speech, action, gait, etc. which reveals the internal love and high-bredness[3].

2. *Hāva* – (Emotion) consists of the movement of eyes and brows betokening the awakening of love[4].

3. *Helā* (Passion) – When the same emotion (Hāva) becomes permanently rooted, and exhibits exuberance of youth and advancement of love without any special object[5], it is termed Helā. In other words, the development of the emotion of love leads to passion.

It has to be noted here that all these three qualities are purely physical, pertaining to body, and are not concerned with any special mental activity. The ND adds that these three mostly arise from one another. Each succeeding quality arises from and exceeds the preceding one. Bhāva, however, does not require any other quality for its manifestation but Hāva requires Bhāva and Helā, in its turn, Hāva.

(ii) *Svabhāvaja*

1. *Vibhrama* – (confusion) is a confusion of actions on account of love, intoxication, delight, etc. Here the lady speaks some thing different from what she actually intends, the ornament of hands is put on feet, that of waist on neck and so on.

These changes in physical movements are innate or born of Svabhāva because they arise out of excessive delight at the arrival of the object of love, while the physical (Aṅgaja) qualities are seen even in the absence of any such cause.

1. ND. p. 204.
2. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 154.
3. Cf. DR II, 33.
4. Cf. DR II, 34.
5. Cf. DR II, 33; NS XXIII, 11.

2. *Vilāsa* (amorous gestures) is charmiagness of limbs as well as action like standing, sitting, moving, looking, etc. in the presence of the beloved.

3. *Vicchitti* – is the simplicity of dress and ornaments which even enhances the charm owing to the excellent beauty and natural grace.

4. *Līlā* – (sportive mimicry) is amorously imitating the speech, dress, activity, etc. of the beloved on account of great regard and love for him.

5. *Vivvoka* (or Bibboka) (affected coldness) is the indifference exhibited towards the favourite objects such as good dress, ornaments etc. on account of pride or arrognace) due to one's good fortune).

6. *Vihṛata* (want of response) – is keeping mum even at a time when one must speak, on account of bashfulness, deceitfulness or innocence (Maugdhya). It is also meant to exhibit one's bashfulness with a purpose.

7. *Lalita* – (lolling) is graceful delicate movement of the limbs such as eyes, hands, etc. without any purpose (just naturally).

Lalita is distinguished from Vilāsa which too indicates graceful movemcnt of the body, only in one point, viz., in Lalita the movement is without any purpose i. e. unintentional, while in Vilāsa it has a definite purpose[1].

8. *Kuṭṭamita* (pretended anger) – is faigned anger when the lover cathes hair, lips, breast, hand, etc. Here there is external repugnance shown even though internally the lady enjoys it.

9. *Moṭṭāyita* – (manifestation of love)[2] implies gestures such as rubbing of limbs, yawning, scratching the ears, etc. as a result of intense love being absorbed in the thoughts of the lover on his arrival or during the talks concerning him.[3]

10. *Kilikiñcita* – (Hysterical mood) is a mixture of smile, tears, fear, laughter, fatigue, anger, pride pain, desire, etc.

These ten qualities are natural in a lady either married or unmarried on account of the development of love[4].

(iii) *Ayatnaja*

1. *Śobhā* (Beauty) – is the brightness of youth, physical charm etc. which a lady obtains when enjoyed by the lover.

---

1. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 161.
2. Vide NS (by M. Ghosh), p. 443.
3. Wilson defines it as " silent expression of returned affection ". Vide Dramas, p. 62.
4. Cf. Abhi. III, p. 159.

2. *Kānti* (charm) - When Śobhā is heightened on account of love it is known as Kānti[1].

3. *Dīpti* (lustre) - When Kānti attains a high pitch it is called Dīpti[2].

4. *Mādhurya* - (sweetness) consists in mildness even at the time of agony or uneasiness caused by pain, anger, fear, jealousy, shame, love, etc.

5. *Audārya* (dignity) is not abandoning modesty etc. even when there are occasions which make a person uneasy.

The only difference between Audārya and Mādhurya is that in the latter there is no change in one's outward appearance, while the former refers to the steadiness of qualities[3].

6. *Dhairya* - (courage) is abstinence from self-eulogy and rashness (Cāpala).

7. *Prāgalbhya* (boldness) is expertness in amorous sports. These seven qualities arise in a woman automatically when she enjoys pleasures of love in the company of her man.

Sanskrit theorists have fairly elaborated this topic. These twenty qualities have been originally mentioned by Bharata in the chapter on Sāmānyābhinaya[4] and the later theorists including Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra have followed the same. The SD, as has been pointed out earlier, adds eight more to the list of Bharata. The authors of the ND, on the other hand, remark that there can be innumerable qualities over and above the twenty mentioned here.

Attendants of the heroine

The ND now touches a minor topic concerning the heroine, viz., her attendants (or helpmates). They are as under :-

Dhātreyī - a nurse who gives milk.

Liṅginī - a nun.

Prātiveśikā - a companion who remains near the heroine at all times.

Śilpinī - one well-versed in fine arts such as painting, carving, etc.

Ceṭikā - a maid-servant.

Sakhī - a female friend.

1. ND IV, 189 also cf. NS (KM) XXII, 26 ab.
2. Cf. NS XXII, 26 cd, DR II, 36.
3. ND, p. 207.
4. NS (KM), XXII.

These are all reliable, clever, knowing the proper place, time, etc. modest, and serious[1].

Dilects

After an elaborate discussion of the hero and the heroine the ND turns to another important issue in a drama, viz., *language or dialect.* Sanskrit drama though called so (i. e. Sanskrit) is not purely in Sanskrit but is bilingual, being a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit with its varied dialects. Strict rules have been imposed by the NS of Bharata as to which language or dialect should be spoken by different characters. Sanskrit was looked upon as a language of the Āryas - the language of the learned - the language of the civilized and cultured class of society. It was called Gīrvāṇagirā, the 'language of the gods', and having a halo of awe, serenity, sanctity and culture around it, Sanskrit could not be spoken and thus defiled by ordinary persons. It was true that all people could comprehend Sanskrit but the right of speaking that 'language of gods' was reserved by a selected few.

The ND first enumerates those who are eligible to speak Sanskrit. Gods (including goddesses), high and middle types of men (excluding women and low men) are always entitled to speak Sanskrit. Sometimes for some special purport even a queen, or a minister's daughter or a harlot may speak Sanskrit. A queen, for instance, may speak in Sanskrit while discussing the military affairs or so, a minister's daughter at the time of declaring justice, a harlot for exhibiting her learning or pedantry. Real ascetics, male as well as female, such as wandering mendicants, Munis, Śākyas, Śrotriyas can speak Sanskrit in order to show their proficiency in all arts. This implies that in the ordinary course the ascetics have to speak in Prakrit; this is an exception to the rule that men other than low-born are eligible to speak Sanskrit. Those who are disguised as ascetics have to speak Prakrit only in order to conceal their identity.

The ND now turns to those characters who have to speak Prakrit. Boys, children, eunuchs, those overpowered by some evil spirits or Grahas such Piśaca, Śani, etc., intoxicated persons, womanish men, women and even high-born men when maddened by penury or power or loss of wealth speak in Prakrit.

Here too extremely low persons, ghosts, evil spirits such as Piśācas have to speak Paiśācī and Māgadhī mixed together. Those who are merely low speak in Śaurasenī. Generally the language should be in accordance with the province to which a person belongs.

1. Cf. NS XXIII, 8-10.

The ND now goes a step further and points out that the language (rather sounds) of other creatures such as birds and beasts should be according to their well-known voices so that there is semblance of reality. Persons of different castes such as Brahmins, Banias, untouchables, etc. should speak in a language customary to their own caste and creed. Similarly, villagers, citizens, Viṭas and others should converse in the dialect current in their respective societies.

The ND concludes this discussion of speech saying that these rules of speech are to be followed generally, but they are not so rigid and are not to be followed blindly. These rules may be violated if the occasion or the plot demands it[1].

The problem of different languages to be used by different characters may appear a little strange at the first sight; but it is not so especially when we keep in mind that India is a land of diversities and differences. Travelling from Kashmir to Konkan and from Kaccha to Assam we come across a huge variety of people differing in castes and customs, putting on different costumes, and speaking diverse languages. It was necessary, therefore, for a dramatist to be conversant with the different dialects and use them at proper places. Drama being an imitation of life demands a keen observation of life[2], in order that it may be realistic. Thus for a work on science of drama it is in the fitness of things to enlighten a budding poet who has not been able to wander all over the country, by giving him the benefit of the vast fund of experience of the past Ṛṣis.

Modes of address

The authors of the ND then turn to an allied topic, viz., how different personages in drama are to be mutually addressed. There are specific rules in Sanskrit drama regarding the mode of address, e. g., a king is to be addressed as 'Mahārāja' (Lord) only. The following persons have to be addressed as Ārya or Āryā (according to the sex)-

The wife, a female ascetic, a brahmin lady, a brahmin, a mother, an elderly woman[3], a revered lady (she may also be addressed as Bhavatī), the elder brother, a minister (by low persons), Naṭī and Sūtradhāra (by each other), a wife (by a priest and a merchant) and an old husband.

A queen addresses her husband as Mahārāja provided he is aged, and as Āryaputra when young. When the acquaintance is new a man addresses a woman as Bhadrā, a beloved wife in youth as Priyā, or with reference to the name of her father or son, such as 'O, daughter

1. ND IV, 195.
2. Nipuṇatā lokaśāstrādyavekṣaṇāt - KP I, 3.
3. Mother and elderly women may also be addressed as Aṁba.

of Māṭhara", "O, mother of Somaśarmā", etc. The chief queen is addressed as Devī by a king and others. A Vidūṣaka addresses a queen or a maid-servant as Bhavatī. Attendants address the queen as Bhaṭṭinī, Svāminī or Devī.

A harlot (if young) is addressed by the attendants as Ajjukā and as Attā if old. A lady addresses another one of her own age, state and similar family as Halā. Attendants (maid-servants) or low ones are to be addressed an Hañje. Gods, goddesses, revered ones, sages, learned persons and also their wives are addressed as Bhagavat(ī). Respectable persons are addressed by names other than their actual one such as "minister", "Śreṣṭhin", "Vatsarāja," "O, crest jewel of Soma-family," etc. (sometimes by one's own name too). Persons of middle class are to be addressed with their name. An ascetic addresses the king as 'Rājan' or 'Bhūpati' or by the ancestral name such as 'Kauravya' etc. Jesters address him as 'Rājan' or 'Vayasya' (friend), low people as Bhaṭṭin and the public - high, middle and low people - call him 'Deva'.

The king addresses the jester as 'friend'. The prince is addressed as 'Kumāra' and the princess as Kumārī; a sage of some other sect according to the conventional name. A stage-manager is to be addressed by his subordinates (i. e. actors) as Bhāva and the former in his turn addresses the latter as 'Mārṣa'. Equals address each other as 'friend' (Sakhā) or by one's own name.

A pupil, a son or a younger brother is addressed by the preceptor, the father, or the elder brother respectively, as 'Putra' (son) or 'Vatsa' or 'Tāta'. An old person too may be addressed as Tāta. A low-born man is addressed by a middle or high-born one as 'Saumya' or 'Bhadra-mukha', by a low-born again as 'Haṇḍe', 'Are' 'Haṁho', etc. A person may be addressed by whatever thing (i. e. work, profession, family or the like) he is well-known, e. g., a person tilling the land may be addressed as 'farmer', a keeper of cows as 'cowherd', a servant as 'servant', a physician as 'doctor' a Brahmin as 'Brahmin' and so on.

This etiquette has to be observed by a playwright. Bharata has treated of this problem in the NS (KM) XVII.

Apparently this set of rules of addressing may strike to be rather strange. It appears that the progress of Sanskrit drama was considerably hampered by the great number of rules of various types that we find to have been elaborately discussed by Bharata and others. As time went on the NS became 'the Bible of dramaturgy" and the rules that were stated therein became binding upon all the later dramatists. These rules which Bharata formulated by consulting a number of literary pieces of

his times were given so much of importance that no young dramatist could dare to challange or violate them. That is why we find a majority of Sanskrit dramas to be highly conventional and lacking in freshness or originality.

But truly speaking these rules are meant for the guidance of a novice artist who has not acquired the vast experience of life. The old sage like Bharata must have a fund of knowledge regarding the ways of the world. He must have moved from place to place and observed the peculiarities of different provinces in speech, dress, customs and traditions. He must have also gone through most of the important plays and literature of his times. He then must have thought is quite proper to help the later writers by means of his knowledge and consequently he gave the rules mentioned above. Really speaking, they were meant as a guide to those who were new to the subject and not to fetter them into rigid chains.

The fact unfortunately is that after Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti we rarely come across a poet of high dramatic talents. Great artists like great men are few and far between. The succeeding poets of lesser talents had little of originality in them and had therefore to tread by the same path. They had no true vision which makes a real artist and so engaged themselves in play of words and went on giving long conventional descriptions even when they were not called for (as an exercise in style).

Nomenclature

Here too certain conventions ought to be observed.

The name of a heroic person should be such as it may suggest his inner qualities, such as Bhīmaparākrama (i. e. possessed of terrific prowess or valour), Arimardana (i e. killer of enemies) etc. The name of a merchant should generally end in "Datta", e. g., Samudradatta, Sāgaradatta, etc. This is generally so; it may be otherwise also such as 'Dhanapati'. The name of a Brahmin must be generally with reference te his family or work (Karma) such as 'Śāṇḍilya (i. e. the descendent of Śaṇḍila', Gārgyāyaṇa, or Agnihotrīya (performer of Agnihotra ceremony), Ātharvaṇika, Sāmaka, etc It may also end in "Śarman" such as Agniśarman, Somaśarman etc The name of a queen ought to be auspicious such as Sulakṣaṇā (having auspicious signs), Vijayavatī etc. The name of a harlot should be generally ending in "Dattā" or "Senā" such as Devadattā, Vasantasenā etc. It may also be different such as Vidagdhamitrā, Vasantaśrī, ete. The name of a maid should pertain to flowers and the like, such as Mālinī, Mallikā or Cūtalatikā, Āmramañjarī, etc.

The name of a servant ought to be suggestive of aucpiciousness such as Siddhārthaka.

The names may also be different in the case of different types of characters in keeping with their purpose.

Even though in actual life we do not find names carrying much significance, still in good old days some significance was attached to the name and consequently we come across awkward names like Lambakarṇa, Śunaḥśepa, etc., in early literature. Moreover, a name would also suggest the caste, community or creed of the person, e g., the name Agniśarmā automatically suggests that the person is a Brahmin, while a name like Śatrughna or Samaraketu undoubtedly indicates that the man is a Ksatriya. This implies that there were certain conventions for nomenclature which were generally observed by all people. What is true of life is also true of literature. In literature the poet should select such names for the characters as are deeply significant[1], e. g , a modern dramatist writing a play concerning the life of second century A. D. cannot give modern names to his characters. Otherwise the drama would fail to create the air of realism. The above-stated rules therefore help a new writer in naming his characters.

Uparūpakas

At the end of the fourth chapter when the ND declares to have discussed all the forms of drama in detail, it points out that there are other forms of Rūpakas also which are available. They are as under[2]:—

1. *Saṭṭaka*[3] (Also known as Sāṭaka) is similar to Nāṭikā[4]. It is written in one language i. e. not in a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit. There are no Viṣkambhaka or Praveśaka. The SP and the KS mention it as one of twelve (principal) Rūpakas.

The SD adds that it should be in Prakrit only. The acts are called Javanikās and the sentiment of wonder should dominate. The example is the Karpūramañjarī[5].

1. A good dramatist is always careful in selection of names of his characters, as he has full freedom in doing so. We can easily see how significantly Kālidāsa, for instance, has named his characters like Anasūyā, Priyaṁvadā, Śārṅgarava and others. The very name here suggests the nature of the character.
2. The ND does not enumerate first but directly begins to define and explain. This is rather unsystematic. Moreover, the ND has literally borrowed the definitions from the SP of Bhoja.
3. D. R. Mankad mentions it among derivative types Vide "The Types of Sanskrit Drama", pp. 93-94.
4. Cf. Karpūramañjarī I, 6.
5. Vide SD VI, 276-277.

The BP takes it to be a variety of Nāṭikā written in Prakrit. Vṛtti is graceful and verbal[1].

Most of the theorists describe Sattaka in terms of Nāṭikā[2]. Dr. Upadhye takes Nāṭikā to have evolved from Ṣaṭṭaka It is difficult to say which of the two evolved out of the other[3].

It should have Adbhuta Rasa in abundance. The NLR does not mention it at all.

The authors of the ND have followed the SP word for word so far as the definition is concerned but they do not put it among the twelve principal Rūpakas as the SP has done. Dr. A. N. Upadhye gives a very interesting etymology of the word "Saṭṭaka" which he considers to be unsanskritic in origin. 'Satta' is split up as Sa+aṭṭa or Āṭa. Aṭṭa is a Dravidian word meaning dance or play and thus the word stood originally as an adjective of a suppressed term, the suppressed term being Rūpaka or Nartana[4].

2. *Śrīgadita* - Here a lady of high birth like Śrī (Lakṣmī) of Viṣṇu narrates before her friend the virtuous qualities of her husband, such as heroism, courage, etc. She is deceived by her lord and gradually scorns him as she sings[5].

The BP adds that it should have one act only. The sentiment is love in separation. Vṛtti is verbal. Garbha and Avamarśa are absent. The hero is well-known

Here the word "Śrī' should be frequently used Some hold that Śrī sings here while sitting.

3. *Durmilitā*[6] - Here a female messenger describes the different types of stealthy, amorous dalliances and by means of rustic stories secretly narrates the love between two young souls and while narrating the story asks for money again and again and even after having it desires for still more.

This is also known as Matallikā. The BP adds that there should be four Acts and four Sandhis excluding Garbha. The KS describes it as Kṣudrakathā in Mahārāṣṭrī. The SD wants six heroines in the second Act.

1. BP, p 269.
2. Rājaśekhara explains it as follows:-"That is known as Saṭṭaka which very much resembles the Nāṭikā, the only difference being that in the former there are no Viṣkambhaka or Praveśaka" Karpūramañjarī I, 6.
3. Candralekhā (Introduction), page 30.
4. Vide Candralekhā (Intro), pp 29-30.
5. ND has literally followed SP here
6. SP (also BP and SD) calls it Durmallikā.

4. *Prasthāna* - It is based on Śṛṅgāra arising out of first love or going on a journey. It should depict the states of desire and anxiety. It should be enriched by descriptions of the monsoon and the spring. It should end in Dīpta Rasas such as Vīra. It contains four Apasāras. It is called Prasthāna as it is concerned with journey[1].

5. *Goṣṭhī* : - Here is delineated the life of lord Kṛṣṇa, moving among the shepherds, which would consist of destruction of enemies and demons[2].

The Abhi. does not mention this type. The BP remarks that it consists of one act. It has nine or ten male characters and five or six females. The principal sentiment is love and the Vṛtti is Kaiśikī. Sandhis are three excluding Garbha and Avamarśa. The plot is imaginary.

6. *Hallīsaka* - This is a sort of dance. Here women dance in a circle. Moreover, there is only one hero among them like Kṛṣṇa among the shepherdesses[3].

SD - It has one act; the Vṛtti is Kaiśikī. The Sandhis are Mukha and Nirvahaṇa. It has 7, 8 or 10 heroines

It may be compared with the operic ballets of the west.

7 *Nartanaka* - Here a female dancer represents a particular incident by a charming dance in keeping with proper time (Tāla). It is of various types such as Śamyā, Lāsya, Chalita, Dvipadī, etc. The ND explains these four types. Śamyā is a particular delicate dance performed by Kinnaras, the celestial singers. Lāsya is a dance conveying the sentiment of love. Chalita is dominated by the sentiments of Love, Heroic, Fierce etc. Dvipadī etc. are different types of metres.

The SD does not mention this as an Uparūpaka. The BP also does not mention this though it gives about twenty varieties of dance.

8. *Prekṣaṇaka*[4] - is an incident or episode which is staged in streets, assemblies, quadrangles or temples. Kāmadahana is its illustration.

The definition by the BP is very vague and ambiguous. According to the SD it has one act and the hero is low-born. There is no Sūtradhāra; Saṁdhis are three excepting Garbha and Avamarśa. It can have all Vṛttis[5].

1. The above definition of Prasthāna verbally agrees with SP and BP, p. 265.
2. The ND has literally borrowed this verse from SP or KS (p. 449).
3. The definition faithfully echoes KS VIII, 4, SP, as well as Abhi. I, p. 181.
4. Preṅkhaṇa - SD.
5. SD VI, 286-287.

9. *Rāsaka* - That is known as Rāsaka where sixteen, twelve or eight ladies dance with various postures such as Piṇḍībandha etc.[1]

Rāsaka can be well compared with modern ballet dance. According to Abhinava, Rāsaka is to be performed by a number of dancing women. It has a charming rhythm. It consists of sixty four pairs maximum. It is of two types - (i) soft and (ii) excited[2].

The SR gives an interesting legendary account of the origin of Rāsaka. Originally Śiva created Tāṇḍava type of dance and Pārvatī created Lāsya. The latter taught this to Uṣā, the wife of Aniruddha, who in her turn imparted it to Gopīs of Dvārāvatī. They then imparted it to young women of Saurāṣṭra[3].

The early definitions of Rāsaka suggest that Rāsaka was not meant for mere recitation or reading but was composed with a view to being sung and danced. It must have been originally a piece of folk-dance and music (It became very popular in Apabhraṁśa or old Gujarati literature).[4]

The BP gives three definitions of Rāsaka at three different places[5]. One is identical with the ND while the other (on p 269) is totally different[6], where Rāsaka is defined as a one-act play with five characters, three Samdhis (excluding Garbha and Avamarśa), a well-known hero and heroine, with Kaiśikī and Bhāratī Vṛtti, decorated with Vīthyaṅgas, different languages, etc. A similar definition is given by the SD[7].

The two different definitions of Rāsaka clearly suggest that originally it was purely a form of dance which is suggested by the definitions of the Abhi. the KS, the SP, the ND, and the BP (first definition), while later on it developed into a form of drama as can be inferred from the definitions of the BP, the NLR and the SD.

10. *Nāṭyarāsaka* - When ladies, at the advent of the spring season, represent by dance the life or actions of a king out of affection for him,

1. The definition of the ND verbally agrees with that of the SP as well as BP, (pp. 263-4). ND explains the term Piṇḍībandha etc. as follows Piṇḍībandha is so called because of huddling up closely. Śṛṅkhalā is so called because of an arrangement of limbs like knitting. Bhedyaka because of splitting up or moving apart and Latā-bandha because of arrangement in the form of a net.
2. Cf. Abhi. I, p. 181.
3. SR VII, 4-8.
4. Vide B. J. Sandesara: Literary circle of Mahāmātya Vastupāla, p. 153.
5. There is a verbal identity between this verse of ND and SP as well as BP, p. 264 lines 8-9.
6. A similar verse is found in SP and BP under the treatment of Rāsaka; vide BP, p. 265.
7. SD VI, 288-290.

it is known as Nāṭyarāsaka. It consists of one Act. Its subjects are love and mirth.

The SD gives an altogether different definition of Nāṭyarāsaka. According to the SD its hero is Udātta. The heroine should be Vāsakasajjā. The principal Rasa is Hāsya accompanied by Śṛṅgāra. It should have plenty of music. Sandhis are two Mukha and Nirvahaṇa. It should have ten Lāsyāṅgas. The BP gives two definitions of the Nāṭyarāsaka. One resembles that of the ND while the other on page 408 is more associated with the definition of the SD.

11. *Kāvya* - is a love-story in one Act interspersed with poetical stanzas and musical air. Here we find Ākṣiptikā, Varṇa, Mātrādhruvaka, Bhagnatāla, Paddhatikā, and Chardanikā [1].

12. *Bhāṇa or Bhāṇaka* - chiefly concerns itself with Viṣṇu, Śiva, the sun, Pārvatī, Kārtikeya or Pramathādhipa. It is dominated by violent action. It has no woman character. It is furnished with descriptions of various things. It contains things which are difficult to a stage but are interesting and captivating. It should be accompanied by Anutāla, Vitāla, etc.

Bhāṇaka is of six types[2] :—

(i) Pure (Śuddha) - provided it is in pure language i. e. Sanskrit.

(ii) Mixed (Saṅkīrṇa) - provided it is in mixed languages such as Sanskrit, Prakrit, etc.

(iii) Citra - if it is in all different languages and is performed by attractive (Citra) action.

(iv) Arrogant - if the action is full of arrogance.

(v) Graceful - if the action therein is charming and graceful.

(vi) Gracefully arrogant - if the action is a mixture of both the qualities[3].

13. *Bhāṇikā* - The essential difference between Bhāṇa and Bhāṇikā, according to the ND, is only this, viz., Bhāṇa is dominated mainly by vigorous action while the latter is found to be tender and graceful. Mostly it has the life of Viṣṇu as its subject.[4] Abhinava calls Bhāṇikā as Masṛṇoddhata (gracefully arrogant)[5].

1. A similar verse is found in SP and BP under the treatment of Rāsaka; vide BP, p. 265.
2. The first three are based on the language and the next group of three is based on the nature of its contents and action.
3. The same divisions are found in the BP as well in the same words. BP, p. 259.
4. Cf. BP, p. 262.
5. Abhi. I, p. 181.

According to the SD it has one Act. The Vṛtti is Kaiśikī and Bhāratī.

Critical Remarks

The number of Uparūpakas varies according to the different theorists. The ND recognizes only thirteen out of the eighteen subordinate types of drama later known as Uparūpakas. The ND and the KS as well, call them "other types of drama". According to the ND dramas are of two types:

1. Where sentiment is predominant.

2. Where sentiment is not predominant[1]. Nāṭaka and the remaining eleven belong to the first type, while the so-called Uparūpakas to the second. The ND mentions them only in the commentary for the simple reason that they are not so interesting and that they are not mentioned by the "Vṛddhas"[2]. The SD uses the term Uparūpaka for these types for the first time. Dhanika simply mentions (does not define or explain) seven types, viz., Ḍombī, Śrīgadita, Bhāna, Bhāṇī, Prasthāna, Rāsaka and Kāvya as varieties of dance. The Abhi. refers to nine types[3]. The KS refers to twelve adding Śrīgadita, Kāvya and Goṣṭhī to the list of Abhinava[4]. The KS seems to have literally borrowed from Abhinava who again ascribes them to ancient ones (Cirantana). Bhoja refers to twelve types[5]. The SD gives eighteen types. The greatest number of Uparūpakas seems to have been given by the BP which mentions as many as twenty. It can also be credited with a detailed and systematic treatment of the same.

Strangely enough the NS does not mention any variety of Uparūpakas. The probable cause seems to be that the Uparūpakas were invented by Kohala[6] and his followers who made the Nāṭyaveda easily accessible to the dramatists by their work[7]. This is supported by a reference from the ND itself which ascribes the authorship of Saṭṭaka and others to Kohala[8]. It is likely that the NS might not have been aware of these

---

1. ND, p. 25.
2. ND, p. 215.
3. Abhi. I, p. 183.
4. Cf. KS, p. 445.
5. SP (MS), pp. 141-145.
6. Stray references to Kohala by the writers on dramaturgy point out that Kohala must have written a celebrated work on music and dance including the Uparūpakas. Abhinava has quoted him very often. He is considered to be the author of Abhinaya-śāstra which may be a part of Kohala's work or any later abridgment of it (Vide Krisnamachariar: History of Sanskrit Literature, pp. 822-3).
7. Cf. Abhi. I, pp. 183-184 The definition of Kāvya is quoted under the name of Kohala and the same is repeated by KS.
8. ND, p. 25, last line.

Uparūpakas excepting Nāṭikā which the NS mentions[1]. The DR too is totally silent on this topic from which it may be inferred that the DR also may be unaware of them. Bhoja divides the Prekṣya Prabandhas into two: Vākyārthābhinaya and Padārthābhinaya. Each has twelve varieties. The former are known as principal Rūpakas and the latter as minor Rūpakas. The KS divides the dramatic literature into two: (1) to be recited (2) to be sung, and includes the Uparūpakas under the latter. Someśvara also calls it 'Geya' type of Prekṣya Kāvya. He also considers it as Padārthābhinaya-svabhāva, following Bhoja. Even the ND calls them 'other Rūpakas' and differentiates them from the earlier twelve Rūpakas on the basis of the place of Rasa which predominates in the latter. In Uparūpakas Rasa has a subordinate place. It is the element of music and dance that prevails here in most cases. The Abhi. calls them musical compositions[2]. Dhanika and the author of the BP call them "varieties of dance" (Nṛtyabhedāḥ). Some of them like Rāsaka, Hallīsaka. Nartanaka, Chalita, Śamyā, Lāsya, etc., are still in the form of dance[3]. As the time went on there was a notable development in the nature of Uparūpakas. The elements of plot, speech, sentiment, etc. were gradually introduced to such an extent that some of these Uparūpakas such as Nāṭikā, Saṭṭaka, Prakaraṇikā[4], Troṭaka, etc. became as good as the Rūpakas. Even though early works like the NS do not refer to the Uparūpakas their origin may be taken as earlier than the Rūpakas.[5] They went on developing simultaneously with Rūpakas, ultimately leading to the present Uparūpakas.

The difference in the total number of Uparūpakas which varies with every rhetorician indicates that there was no unanimity regarding their number and the great difference in the various definitions of one and the same Uparūpaka (at times in the same work) clearly suggests that they had a popular origin and that they underwent continuous changes and modifications in their nature and form, from time to time[6].

1. It is also likely that Uparūpakas were in a very initial stage of development in the times of Bharata and were systematized later on.
2. Cf. Prabandhāḥ nṛtyātmakāḥ–Abhi. I, p. 183.
3. They were of the form of modern 'ballets'
4. D. R. Mankad calls them 'Derivative types'. Vide The Types of Sanskrit Drama, pp. 91–96.
5. Dance is supposed to be the earliest form of expressing one's joy and emotions. Even at present it is found in backward tribes (Zulu and others). Abhinava's reference to "Cirantana" authorities with regard to the Uparūpakas also corroborates this view. (Abhi. I, p. 141).
6. It is also not improbable that Kohala who was supposed to be the originator of the Uparūpakas was not looked upon as such a binding authority as Bharata and so there are bewildering variations as regards their nature and number.

The word 'Uparūpaka', the earliest mention of which we find in the SD,[1] seems to be rather misleading in the sense that it is translated as "minor Rūpakas". It is true that most of the Uparūpakas have music or dance as their predominant element, still it is not proper to attribute the word "Minor" to them as some of them like Nāṭikā, Prakaraṇikā, Saṭṭaka, Troṭaka, etc. are as good as the so called "major Rūpakas". The above-mentioned types of the minor Rūpakas are in no way inferior to the Rūpakas from the point of view of plot-construction, characterisation, delineation of sentiments, etc. Even in bulk they surpass some of the Rūpakas which are simply one-act plays, as we know that not less than fifty percent of the Rūpakas have only one act, while some of the above-mentioned Uparūpakas have four acts (Troṭaka has five to nine acts). And that is why probably the authors of the ND call them "other Rūpakas".

The word Uparūpaka can better be understood in a slightly different way. The prefix "Upa" is very often used in the sense of "near." Uparūpakas are so called because they are very near to the Rūpakas, the essential difference being that in the former there is preponderance of dance and music.

Concluding Verses

In the five concluding verses our authors briefly evaluate their own work. In the first verse they pay glorious tribute to Hemacandra, their learned preceptor, whom they regard as an authority on grammar, logic, poetics and metrics. In verse No. 2 they refer to the pains they had to take in writing the work and have mildly reproached those unfair critics who themselves are unable to write anything original (and who have earned a name by somehow plagiarising from others' works)[2] but whose sole interest is just to criticise. In the remaining verses the authors have tried to draw the attention of the readers to the outstanding merits of their work. Their Kārikās and the Vṛtti are neither too brief nor too elaborate and are apt to convey the sense. Like the threefold current of the Ganges their learning is also threefold: grammar, logic and literature. At the end they claim that if anybody desires to get a real life-like picture of the Rūpakas he should look into this pure (i. e. faultless) Nāṭyadarpaṇa (the mirror of drama)[3].

1. SD VI, 6.
2. A very similar verse is found in the Mallikāmakaranda (I, 7).
3. How far these claims are justified has been discussed in detail in Chapter VII of the present work.

PART - II

CHAPTER V

LIFE, DATE AND WORKS OF RĀMACANDRA AND GUṆACANDRA

Personal history of the authors :[1]

The present work Nāṭyadarpaṇa is an outcome of the joint authorship of two Jaina monks - Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra - whose names are mentioned in the colophons at the end of each of the four chapters of the Kārikās as well as the commentary on them.

As regards the personal history of Rāmacandra we are not completely left in the dark. All the same, the information that we get is meagre and not so satisfactory. So many questions appear before our minds when we think of our author, e. g., where was he born, what was his family, what were the names of his parents, where did he study, where, when and how did he accept asceticism and so on. Most of these questions are likely to remain unanswered. Still an attempt is made here to gather whatever information is available and to present it as systematically as possible.

The chief sources from which we get the glimpses of Rāmacandra's life and some of its incidents are as follows :[2].

1. His own works.
2. Prabhāvakacarita of Candraprabhasūri (1277 A.D.)
3. Upadeśataraṅgiṇī of Ratnamandiragaṇi (1460 A.D.)
4. Prabhandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuṅgasūri (1310 A.D.)[3]
5. Kumārapālaprabandha of Jinamaṇḍanagaṇi (1435 A.D.)
6. Prabandhakośa of Rājaśekharasūri (1348 A.D.).

At the outset from the Nāṭyadarpaṇa itself we are given to understand that he was the chief disciple (Paṭṭadhara) of Hemacandra who flourished in the days of Kumārapāla. Due homage is paid to the learned preceptor Hemacandra by our authors in the concluding verses at the end of the work.[4]

That he was the chief disciple of Hemacandra is also known from the following works of his own :-

1. While writing this I have utilized the introduction to the Nalavilāsa (published by G. O. S.) by Shri L. B. Gandhi.
2. Pandit Bechardas Doshi in his work Hemacandrācārya refers to the pupils of Hemacandra but we do not find any special noteworthy information about them.
3. According to P.V. Kane the date is 1307 A.D.
4. ND. p. 215.

1. Prelude to Nalavilāsa
2. Prelude to Satyahariścandra
3. Prelude to Nirbhayabhīmavyāyoga
4. Prelude to Raghuvilāsa
5. Prelude to Kaumudīmitrāṇanda.

The Prabhāvakacarita of Candraprabhasūri relates to an incident where once Siddharāja Jayasiṁha out of sheer curiosity inquires of Hemacandra as to whom he considers to be his chief disciple. The latter then names Rāmacandra of excellent virtues, the best among the blessed ones to be fit for inheriting and maintaining his office[1]. Once he showed an eulogy to the king composed by Rāmacandra which was quite original and captivating. He had said, "The victorious do not tolerate any other person to exceed them even by an inch. So may you, O lord of the earth, supercede the Lord of Dhārā." The king was highly impressed by this.

Truly Rāmacandra was a chip of the old block. It was therefore quite in the fitness of things that the learned preceptor reckoned him to be the chief of his pupils. His deep and mature learning of all sciences, clear thinking, excellent mode of representation, lucid, perspicuous and dignified style are exemplified by the ND and other works. That he has tried various forms of drama also points out that he is not merely a learned critic but is a dramatist and a poet as well. He has thoroughly imbibed the principles of dramaturgy which he theoretically discussed in his work on dramatics. His mastery over language and his handling of different topics deserve appreciation.

Ready-wittedness of Rāmacandra :

Rāmacandra was given the title of Kavikaṭāramalla by Siddharāja Jayasiṁha as he was pleased by the ready-wittedness in poetry of this poet ever since his early age. An account of this is found in the Upadeśataraṅgiṇī of Ratnamandira, the author of Bhojaprabandha. The story runs as follows :

Once the king Jayasiṁha accompanied by seventy two feudal kings went to a pleasure-garden. The summer season had set in. On his way he met Rāmacandra. With a view to testing the knowledge and ready-wittedness of this young poet, Jayasiṁha put to him the following question: 'Why are the days so long in summer ?'. To this, ready-witted Rāmacandra instantly replied that the days were long because the horses of the sun could not resist the temptation of testing the Dūrvā grass grown on the banks of the heavenly Ganges, which had

1. Prabhāvakacarita, p. 304, verses 129-135.

become muddy on account of the wind-driven dust which arose from the earth which was pulverized by the harsh hoofs of the running horses of the heroes as he (Jayasiṁha) set out for world-conquest.[1]

Siddharāja was highly delighted or rather astounded at the extempore versification of Rāmacandra which revealed his poetic genius, his high imaginative power and the devotion to the king himself. So he again asked Rāmacandra to describe the town instantly. Instantly Rāmacandra gave a poetic and ornate description of the town in a verse containing a charming Utprekṣā whereupon the king was so much pleased that he conferred on Rāmacandra the title of Kavikaṭāramalla in the presence of all.[2]

The Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuṅga briefly refers to this discourse between Rāmacandra and Siddharāja as follows - One day Siddharāja asked Rāmacandra why the days were long in summer, whereupon Rāmacandra said, 'O, Lord', etc.[3]

Merutunga refers to another interesting episode which took place in the court of Kumārapāla, where Rāmacandra gave a very apt retort to Paṇdit Viśveśvara of Benaras, as he tried to make fun of Hemacandra by comparing him with a shepherd who too carries a blanket and a stick[4].

Rāmacandra was highly diligent in writing. In his prelude to Raghuvilāsa he refers to himself (through Sūtradhāra) as 'acumbita-kāvyatandra' i.e. one who has never been idle in composing poetry. In prelude to Kaumudīmitrāṇanda also he refers to himself as "Viśīrṇa-kāvyanirmāṇatandra." This points to his love for poetry and his zeal in poetic composition.

Rāmacandra loses his one eye :

The Prabhāvakacarita gives an account of Rāmacandra's loss of his

---

1. Upadeśataraṅgiṇī, p. 62. An almost similar account is found in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi (p. 63) also.
2. The verse runs as follows -

   एतस्यास्य पुरस्य पौरवनिताचातुर्यतानिर्जिता
   मन्ये नाथ सरस्वती जडतया नीरं वहन्ती स्थिता ।
   कीर्तिस्तम्भमिषोच्चदण्डरुचिरामुत्सृज्य वाहावली-
   तन्त्रीकां गुरुसिद्धभूपतिसरस्तुम्बीं निजां कच्छपीम् ॥

3. Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 63.
4. Ibid. p. 89. Viśveśvara said :

   पातु वो हेमगोपालः कम्बलं दण्डमुद्वहन् ।

   whereupon Rāmacandra completed the verse as under :

   षड्दर्शनपशुग्राम चारयन् जैनगोचरे ॥

   and thus turns the verse as a glorious tribute to Hemacandra.

right eye. The work, having provided the reader with general information about Siddharāja and Rāmacandra, proceeds as follows - When Hemacandra introduced Rāmacandra to Siddharāja, Siddharāja asked him to be one-sighted i.e., concentrated (ekadṛṣṭi) in Jaina law. Consequently Rāmacandra lost one of his eyes the very moment.[1]

Merutuṅgasūri gives another account for the loss of one eye of Rāmācandra. He states, "All learned people were once called to see the Sahasraliṅgapraśasti by the poet Śrīpāla, engraved on a stone. On account of courtesy towards Śrīpāla and considering the king's regard for the same, all those who were present said that the poem was quite nice and specially, appreciated a verse beginning with 'Kośenāpi' etc.[2] Rāmacandra found out faults of grammar in that very verse and so one of his eyes was lost."[3]

There are two other legends with regard to this loss of eye. According to one, Rāmacandra was unruly and was taken before the sage Jayarṇa. He made him devote himself to the propagation of the Jaina faith with a single eye. Thus Rāmacandra lost one eye. Another legend goes that Rāmacandra criticised the poem of Śrīpāla inspite of the warning of his teacher. This loss of an eye came as a punishment for the above sin.

In several Stotras in praise of Jinas composed by Rāmacandra we we find a suggestion of this particular incident of the poet's loss of one eye. The poet supplicates the Jinas to bestow eyesight upon him. Of course the general meaning would be, according to the context, that the poet urges for spiritual eyesight to enlighten the path of salvation, which is darkened by the blindness of ignorance. But a repeated urge of this type appears to be significant and possessing double meaning. The demand for eyesight from Lord Jina may conveniently be referring to the loss of the physical eye, as a true votary of the Lord would naturally approach Him in times of difficulty. So it is quite in the fitness of things that the poet should demand it from the Lord (Jina).

A paranomastic reference to this demand for eyesight is found in the Nemistava - a devotional song in praise of Lord Neminātha, one of the 24 Tīrthankaras. The verse runs as follows:

---

1. Prabhāvakacarita, verses 137 to 138
2. Kośenāpi yutam dalair upacitam nocchettum etat kṣamam
   Svasyāpi sphuṭakaṇṭakavyatikaram puṁstvam ca dhatte na hi,
   Eko 'pyesa karoti kośarahito niskaṇṭakam bhūtalaṁ
   Matvaivaṁ kamalā vihāya kamalam yasyāsim āśiśriyat.
   Rāmacandra points out two faults - (i) the word 'Dala' indicates 'army' (ii) the word 'Kamala' is neuter gender.
3. Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 64.

"O Nemi, lovely and brilliant like a creeper-like sharp-edged sword, O God, bestow upon me eyesight having pure brilliance like that of the moon, so that the enveloping heaps of darkness may instantly be dispelled and immediately there may flash forth eternal light."

We clearly find here an indirect suggestion to the above incident. Another similar verse is found in the concluding verse of each of the sixteen 'Sādhāraṇa Jinastavas'.

"O highly delightful Lord, a desire-yielding tree for endless fruit, who makes the whole world bend low (before him with respect) on account of his life as pure as the moon, whose lotus-like feet are worshipped by Indra, O God, may you be pleased with me in this multitude of difficulties, shower mercy, and bestow the eyesight upon me".[1]

Vyatirekadvātriṁśikā too refers to this blindness of Rāmacandra in the concluding verses.[2]

Death of Hemacandra :

More books than one declare that Hemacandra, the preceptor of Rāmacandra, died in Vikrama Saṁvat 1229 (i. e. 1173 A. D.). King Kumārapāla of Caulukya dynasty who was a devout votary of Hemacandra was deeply shocked at this. This despondent king was consoled by Rāmacandra and others. The above account is found in the Kumārapālacarita written by Jayasiṁha sūri dated Vikrama Saṁvat 1422 (i. e. 1366 A.D.). The account goes as follows :-

"On account of the death of Hemacandra, the Caulukya king (Kumārapāla) confounded as it were, on all sides, did not know what to do at all. Then learned men like Rāmacandra and others advised him daily and after some days any how lessened his grief.

In the Vikrama Saṁvat 1230 (i. e. 1174 A.D.) when not more than six months had passed after the death of Hemacandra king Kumārapāla being affected by the poison given by his nephew Ajayapāla, called Rāmacandra and asked him to perform "Paryantārādhana".

The verse in the Kumārapālacarita runs as follows -

"Then the royal sage (Kumārapāla) having called the great sage Rāmacandra started to perform Paryantārādhana according to the sacred precept.[3]

1. Jainastotrasaṁgraha, pp. 162-190
2. Cf. जगति पूर्वविधेर्विनियोगजं विधिनताऽन्ध्यगलत्तनुतादिकम् ।

— Vyatirekadvātriṁśikā, v. 31.

3. Canto 10, verse 235.

Death of Rāmacandra :

This great poet who was held in high esteem by king Kumārapāla and others and who was reckoned to be the author of one hundred works met a sorrowful death. "The prince of the learned" was put to death in an inhuman manner by the wicked king Ajayapāla. The account of this as found in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutungasūri is as follows:

As Rāmacandra, the author of one hundred works, was made to sit on a heated piece of copper by that wretched king, he uttered the verse - "That lord of the day (i. e. the sun) who cast his feet on the surface of the entire earth consisting of animate as well as inanimate objects should set within no time." With these words he committed suicide by cutting the tip of his tongue by his teeth. Yet he was again put to death by the cruel king (in spite of the fact that he was dead)[1].

The above-mentioned work gives the following account of the death of Ajayapāla who performed evil deeds like killing a great poet sage Rāmacandra :-

In accordance with the authoritative lines viz., "The doer of a very sinful or meritorious deed achieves the fruit (of his action) here (i. e. in this world) only within three years, three months, three fortnights or three days," that bad monarch was killed with a sword (Kṣurikā) by a servant named Vayajaladeva and he perished having experienced hell daily, being devoured by worms as he committed sin even at sacred places. From Vikrama Saṁvat 1230 (i. e. 1174 A D.) onwards Ajayadeva ruled for three years.

The Prabandhakośa of Rājaśekhara sūri states as under :

Thus as the time passed on, king Kumārapāla as well as Hemacandra grew old. In the group of pupils of Hemacandra, there was rivalry. The group of Rāmacandra ane Gunacandra happened to be on one side and Bālacandra on the other. The latter developed intimate friendship with Ajayapāla, the nephew of the king.

One night king Kumārapāla, preceptor Hemacandra and Ābhaḍa entered into a secret council. The king respectfully asked the learned preceptor as to whom he should entrust the kingdom with after his death, sonless as he was. The preceptor (Hemacandra) advised the king to give the throne to Pratāpamalla, the son of his daughter, in order that the religion may be well maintained and pointed out that Ajayapāla was going to destroy the religion founded by the king. Here Ābhaḍa opined that whatever the character of the man may be, one who is personally related should be preferred. Hemacandra reasserted that under

1. Prabandhacintāmaṇi p. 97.

no circumstances should Ajayapāla be made the king. With this secret counsel, the three persons dispersed.

The secret talk was overheard by Bālacandra and was narrated to Ajayapāla. Consequently Ajayapāla bore enmity against Rāmacandra and other favourite pupils of Hemacandra and loved Ābhaḍa.

After some time, Hemacandra joined the majority and on the thirty second day after his death, king Kumārapāla too breathed his last being poisoned by Ajayapāla. Ajayapāla acquired the throne. Out of hatred for Hemacandra, Ajayapāla tortured his pupils viz., Rāmacandra and others to death by forcing them to sit on a heated iron seat. Many of the Jain Vihāras (convents) in the domain were levelled to the ground. Having called young Jain monks (Laghukṣullakas) he made them practise hunting every day with a view to deriding them as they followed formerly the order of the Jain convent (Caitya).

Bālacandra, the root-cause of this calamity, met the fate which he deserved. He was looked down upon by all Brahmins pointing to him with the words : "Here is the killer of one's own family." He was so much ashamed that he left for Mālavā country and died there.

Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha gives the account as under :-

Rāmacandra and Bālacandra were the pupils of Hemacandra. The preceptor imparted special learning and honour to Rāmacandra having reckoned him a worthy pupil. Being infuriated by this Bālacandra went away. He made friendship with Ajayapāla. When the latter became king, he asked Rāmacandra to impart all learning which he had received from Hemacandra to his friend Bālacandra. Rāmacandra said, "How can the learning of the preceptor be imparted to an unworthy person ?" Then the king ordered him to sit on fire .... Rāmacandra, while sitting on fire having cut his tongue, composed Dodhakapañcaśatī[1].

Personality of Rāmacandra :

Rāmacandra, the author of Prabandhaśata, was a man of great learning. He himself proclaims his proficiency in the three sciences viz., grammar, logic, and poetics[2]. He must have been well-versed in other sciences also.

Rāmacandra was proud of himself and of his learning. He thought much of himself.[3] In the ND also he criticizes the unworthy critics whose only object is to criticise.

---

1. Purātanaprabandhasaṃgraha, p. 49.
2. ND, p. 215.
3. His fault finding in the Sahasraliṅgapraśasti of Śrīpāla does suggest his learning, but at the same time it also hints at his lack of modesty.

In the prologues to all his plays he eulogises himself and tries to establish his superiority over other poets like Murāri and others.

Rāmacandra was equally fearless. He refused to succumb to any threats. He refused to impart knowledge to Bālacandra whom he considered to be an unworthy pupil, even at the order of king Ajayapāla[1] and preferred death to surrender. His end was really worthy of a hero.

He loved freedom. In the NLV he occasionally refers to the pleasures of freedom.[2] In his Nirbhay. as well as the Satya. he reckons freedom to be the shower of joy.[3] In the Bharatavākya of the Nirbhay., the MM, the Satya., the YBH, etc., there is a prayer for freedom.

Temperamentally he must have been jovial as compared to his co-pupil Guṇacandra who appears to be rather serious and sober. In his drama he tries to create humour by humorous speeches and by cutting jokes.

Rāmacandra was a devout monk, which is testified to by a great number of the devotional songs that he has composed He very much respected his religious preceptor Hemacandra.

He did inherit the learning and erudition of his great 'Guru', but he did not have the tact of winning popularity which Hemacandra had, otherwise he would not have met with such a tragic end.

Co-pupils of Rāmacandra :

Hemacandra on account of his towering personality had a great band of votaries and disciples. Rāmacandra obviously was the most favourite of them all. The names of other seven who must have been favoured by Hemacandra more than the remaining huge lot of ordinary pupils are given below. These can safely be regarded as the co-students of Rāmacandra, one of whom was Guṇacandra, in the partnership of whom Rāmacandra wrote serious and scientific works such as the Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Dravyālaṁkāra. The names of those seven pupils of Hemacandra other than Rāmacandra are as under :

1. *Guṇacandragaṇi* He seems to have been a great favourite of Rāmacandra, being rather equal in knowledge and merits to himself and that is why the latter wrote two above-mentioned works in the joint authorship with him. Of course we do not come across any independent work of Guṇacandra and so possibly he might not have written any work

1. Purātanaprabandhasaṁgraha, p. 49.
2. Cf. NLV-" If there be no freedom as long as one lives, useless is the magnificence of heaven and earth" (II, 2). Also Cf. "A free man does not know the agony of a dependent" (VI, 7). Even in the final verse of the play there is a desire for freedom (Svatantro bhava-VII, 13).
3. Cf. Nirbhay. I, 2; Satya. 1, 5.

independently. It appears that he was a man of sober and serious nature, more inclined to serious study and learning and less inclined to writing or earning fame and reputation by contributing something by himself. But Rāmacandra was conscious of the deep learning of his co-student and that is why such a voluminous writer as Rāmacandra was, he preferred to seek the aid of his friend and the fruit of this co-operative effort is the ND[1]. A reader of the work cannot but be impressed by the erudition of the authors and the clarity of expression which indirectly reflects the personality of the authors. Guṇacandra also joined hands with Rāmacandra in writing a philosophical work called Dravyālaṁkāra.

2. *Mahendrasūri* - He has written detailed commentaries on Abhidhānacintāmaṇi and Nighaṇṭukośa of Hemacandra. He also wrote a commentary called Anekārthakairavakakaumudī on Hemacandra's Anekārthasaṅgraha and ascribed to it the authorship of Hemacandra.

3. *Vardhamāna gaṇi* - He has written a commentary on Kumāravihārapraśasti, where he draws one hundred ond sixteen meanings from that poem. This reflects upon the great scholarship of the commentator.

4. *Devacandramuni* - He has written a Prakaraṇa type of drama named Candralekhāvijaya in about 1207 A. D.[2] He is also said to have written another work called Mānamudrābhañjana. But it is not available at present.[3]

5. *Yaśaścandra* - We find his name mentioned in Prabandhacintāmaṇi (Vikrama era 1361).[4] He is also referred to in Prabhāvakacarita (verse no. 737) and Kumārapālaprabandha (p. 188). No work of his has still been discovered. Shri K. M. Munshi[5] and Shri Ramanlal Modi[6] consider him to be the writer of a Prakaraṇa named Mudritakumuda but Shri Bhogilal Sandesara points but that their view is wrong.

6. *Udayacandra* - No work of his is available at present but it is said that his preachings inspired many others. Being inspired by him Devendra wrote a commentary named Katiciddurgapadavyākhyā on Siddhahemabṛhadvṛtti and another work called Upamitiprapañcakathāsāroddhāra. Dr. Buhler considers Devendra, the commentator on Haimabṛhadavṛtti, as a pupil of Udayacandra.[7] Prabandhacintāmaṇi (p. 147)

1. Guṇacandra, along with Mahendrasūri and Vardhamānagaṇi, is respectfully referred to by Somaprabhasūri in the concluding verses (p. 478) of the Kumārapālapratibodha which is said to have been read before them.
2. Vide-Pupils of Hemacandra, page 18.
3. For details - See Jesalmer Bhaṇḍāra Sūci, page 46.
4. Page 133 and pages 143-144.
5. Gujarat and its literature, p. 47.
6. Buddhi Prakāśa, January 1930 - Pāṭanagaranā Granthakāra.
7. Vide - Life of Hemacandra, p. 81.

gives an interesting episode of Udayacandra's mastery over grammar. Once Udayacandra was reading the Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra in the presence of king Kumārapāla. There he corrected the original reading of the line - Dantakeśanakhāsthitvagromṇāṁ grahaṇam ākare - by putting 'Romṇaḥ' in place of Romṇāṁ. Being questioned by Hemacandra he pointed out that Dvandva compounds, with limbs of animals, musical instruments etc. as their members, govern a singular number. All were pleased with this explanation.

7, *Bālacandra* - The last member of this group is Bālacandra. He does not appear to be a worthy pupil of such a great Ācārya as Hemacandra. He envied the high honour and prominence which his preceptor gave to Rāmacandra. He was a rival of Rāmacandra. He was formerly a friend of Ajayapāla. He poisoned the ears of Ajayapāla against Rāmacandra and was the cause of the tragic death of Rāmacandra which is referred to earlier.

He is supposed to have written a prayer named Snātasyā.

Prabandhakośa (p. 98) states that the Brahmins condemned him before king Ajayapāla as the killer of one's own family. Bālacandra, being ashamed, went to Mālava where he breathed his last.

Date of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra :

'History is the one weak spot in Indian literature,' says Macdonell,[1] the celebrated Sanskrit scholor of the west. The dates of some of the greatest of our poets and dramatists like Kālidāsa and others remain unsettled. But it is not so, fortunately, in the case of our authors. The date of our authors can be fixed with precision.

Both Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra are known to be the pupils of the great Jaina Ācārya Hemacandra. Even in the ND, our authors have paid a glorious tribute to their learned preceptor. So, undoubtedly both of these authors were contemporaries. It is likely that Rāmacandra might have been a little older than Guṇacandra as the former was the chief disciple of Hemacandra who had nominated him as his heir. About Hemacandra's date there is no controversy at all. He was born in 1088 A.D. and died in 1172 A.D. His life-history indicates that he had witnessed three royal successions. He flourished in the reign of Jayasiṁha Siddharāja and Kumārapāla. Prabandhacintāmaṇi and other works mention some incidents relating to Rāmacandra and Siddharāja. Siddharāja ascended the throne in 1094 A.D. and reigned upto 1143 or 1145 A.D.[2] He was succeeded by Kumārapāla who died in 1172 A.D.,

1. History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 10.
2. Struggle for Empire, p. 76.

soon after the death of Hemacandra.[1] Kumārapāla was succeeded by Ajayapāla in the year 1172 A.D.[2] and soon after his coronation he put Rāmacandra to death.

Thus Rāmacandra died an unnatural death in about 1172 A.D. or 1173 A.D. i.e. immediately after the death of Hemacandra and Kumārapāla. The fact that he was given the title of Kavikaṭāramalla by Jayasiṁha goes to suggest that he had earned a name as a poet by that time. Thus Rāmacandra can be said to have flourished between C. 1125 A.D. to 1173 A.D. and might have written the ND in the latter half of the twelth century (C. 1150 A.D. to 1170 A.D.).

Guṇacandra also, being his co-student, can be put in the same time i.e. twelfth century. He may have lived longer than Rāmacandra as he is not known to have the misfortune of meeting a premature death as Rāmacandra did. Of course we are completely in the dark regarding his end.

Works of Rāmacandra

Rāmacandra's name is preceded by the appelation Prabandhaśatakartṛmahākavi - a great poet and the writer of a hundred works. This title is mentioned by Rāmacandra himself in the introduction to some of his own works.[3] Merutuṅga also refers to him as "Prabandhaśatakartā"[4]. From these references we can reasonably infer that he must have written about one hundred works.

The word Prabandhaśatakartṛ which Rāmacandra uses for himself can also be taken as the "author of Prabandhaśata" (a work of that name). This work is mentioned in Bṛhaṭṭippaṇikā and this view is stated by Muni Shri Puṇyavijayajī in his preface to the Kaumudī. It has been stated that this work dealt with dramaturgy. This view though quite plausible is open to the following considerations :-

(1) No such work as Prabandhaśata has been still discovered. Had it been such an important work that he could pride himself on as he refers to in the prologues of the Kaumudī, and the NBh, we should find some traces of such a great work. Rāmacandra apparently refers to this fact with pride which means that the work must be of a very high merit and must have earned him wide reputation.

(2) It is also stated that the work deals with dramaturgy. It is difficult to understand why one and the same author should undertake to write two works on the same subject which though not unlikely in modern times was not so common in early days.

1. Struggle for Empire, p. 77.
2. Ibid. p., 78.
3. (a) Prabandhaśatavidhānaniṣṇātabuddhinā - Kaumudī. (prologue).
   (b) Prabandhaśatakartṛmahākavirāmacandrasya - Nirbhayabhīma.
4. Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 97.

(3) The name too is rather perplexing and does not give any idea about the nature of the work. It is still more perplexing as to how it can be dealing with dramaturgy.

(4) No where in the ND Rāmacandra ever mentions this work. Had it been such an important work, the authors should have mentioned it or quoted from it as they have done from other works. Moreover, the ND treats of the subject so elaborately that another work on the some subject would naturally be redundant.

Thus it is difficult to understand how the word Prabandhaśata can be taken as the name of a work and that too dealing with dramaturgy. On the contrary, it is not necessary to take the word as a proper noun at all when the word can be interpreted in the simple sense that Rāmacandra was a voluminous writer and several of his works have been found. As many as forty seven of Rāmacandra's works are known at present, and it is possible that Rāmacandra wrote a number of works which might have been nearly one hundred, if not actually hundred. Even Śatakas that we have to day in Sanskrit do not have actually a huudred verses only. The practice of exaggerating things is not uncommon with Sanskrit writers and so the capacity of Rāmacandra to write a number of works might have earned him this title. The word 'hundred' should not therefore be taken literally but rather metaphorically to mean "good many" or "nearly hundred"[1]. The word 'Śata' has been used by Rāmacandra himself in the sense of "nearly hundred" as can be seen from the title of his Kumāravihāraśataka which contains precisely one hundred and sixteen verses.

Moreover it was not uncommon among the Jaina monks who perfectly devoted themselves to reading and writing to have written voluminously, e.g., Haribhadra is considered to be the writer of fourteen hundred Prakaraṇas. Even Hemacandra, the preceptor of our authors, is known to be a voluminous writer.

Even if we understand "Prabandhaśata" as a book of that name, it is also possible to understand it as "hundred works" considering the vast amount of dramas and poems that he has written. This view of Prabandhaśata meaning hundred works is accepted by most of the scholars.[2]

Rāmacandra has tried his hand in almost all important forms of drama such as Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā, Vyāyoga, etc. He has also written poems as well as Stotras in praise of Jaina Tīrthaṅkaras. He

1. The practice of using the numericals in such a sense is as old as the RV. Cf. RV X, 90 1, where the word 'Sahasra' is used in the sense of 'many'.
2. L. B. Gandhi, (Intro to NLV), Prof. H. R. Kapadia (Jain Sāhityano Itihāsa); Muni Caturavijaya, (Introduction to Jainastotrasandoha) and others.

is known to have written two serious works in collaboration with Guṇacandra - one on the science of dramaturgy (ND) and the other on Jaina Nyāya (Dravyālaṁkāra).

It is true that all of his works are not available. Many of them still remain to be searched out.[1]

We now mention below works of Rāmacandra which are known to us so far :

A. *Plays*

1. Nalavilāsa
2. Satyahariścandra
3. Nirbhayabhīma
4. Kaumudīmitrāṇanda
5. Mallikāmakaranda*
6. Rohiṇīmṛgāṅka*
7. Yādavābhyudaya*
8. Rāghavābhyudaya*
9. Raghuvilāsa*
10. Yaduvilāsa*
11. Vanamālā*

B. *Scientific works*

12. Dravyālaṅkāra* (with Guṇacandra)
13. Nāṭyadarpaṇa (with Guṇacandra)
14. Haimabṛhadvṛttinyāsa*

C. *Poems and Stotras*

15. Kumāravihāraśataka
16. Sudhākalaśa*
17. Dodhakapañcaśatī*
18. Yugādidevadvātriṁśikā
19. Vyatirekadvātriṁśikā
20. Prasādadvātriṁśikā
21. Apahnutidvātriṁśikā
22. Arthāntaranyāsadvātriṁśikā
23. Jinastutidvātriṁśikā
24. Dṛṣṭāntagarbhajinastutidvātriṁśikā
25. Śāntidvātriṁśikā
26. Bhaktyatiśayadvātriṁśikā
27. Ādidevastava

* The works marked with an asterisk (*) are not published.

1. Shri Punyavijayaji Maharaja is soon to bring out six plays of Rāmacandra adding Mallikāmakaranda and Raghuvilāsa to the four already published.

28. Nemistava
29. Munisuvratadevastava
30 - 46. Ṣoḍaśikāḥ Sodhāranajinastavāḥ
47. Jinastotras*

Out of these forty seven[1] works the first eleven are different forms of Rūpakās. Rāmacandra refers to them as Svopajña, i.e., his own compositions, in the ND. Out of these numbers 1, 2, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are Nāṭakas. Numbers 4, 5 and 6 are Prakaraṇas. Number 11 is a Nāṭikā. Number 3 is a Vyāyoga

Numbers 12 and 13 i. e. Nāṭyadarpaṇa and Dravyālaṁkāra[2] are not his independent works. These works are of scientific nature and have been written in collaboration with Guṇacandra, one of his fellow students. No. 14 is a Nyāsa.

Numbers 15, 16 and 17 are poems. The rest are Stotras in praise of of various Tīrthaṅkaras.

It is very probable that a large number of works of this voluminous writer (writer of one hundred works) still remains unknown being devoured by time the tyrant. Still whatever works are extant go a long way to give a fair insight into the literary talents of our author. The number forty seven is enough to give him the title of a voluminous writer. His contribution to Sanskrit literature cannot, therefore, be overlooked.

Rāmacandra as a Dramatist and Poet

It will not be out of place if we study in some detail the plays and poems of Rāmacandra especially in view of the fact that the works have not been adequately taken note of so far. and thereby form our own estimate of Rāmacandra as a dramatist as well as a poet.

(*A*) *Plays of Rāmacandra*

Out of the eleven plays composed by Rāmacandra only four have seen the light of the day so far. They are (i) the Nalavilāsa, (ii) the Satyahariścandra, (iii) the Kaumudīmitrāṇanda and (iv) the Nirbhaya-bhīma. Let us study each of them in detail.

---

1. Ācārya Viśveśvara in his introduction to the Hindi Nāṭyadarpaṇa (p. 16) mentions only thirty nine of Rāmacandra's works. Here he does not seem to have taken note of the Jainastotrasaṅgraha wherein as many as twenty nine of Rāmacandra's Stotras are published. Here he appears to have followed L. B Gandhi's introduction to the Nalavilāsa (p. 33).

2. Dravyālaṁkāra is a work on Jaina Nyāya It is divided into three chapters. The first chapter deals with Dravya, the second with Guṇa and the third with Paryāya. The work contains Sūtras and the commentary over them by the authors themselves, At present only two chapters (II and III) are discovered.

1. *Nalavilāsa*[1] :

It is a Nāṭaka with Nala as the hero. Nala figures as one of the most popular heroes of ancient India and his life is often woven into a play or a big poem.[2]

In Act I, a spy of Citrasena, the king of Cedī, disguised as a Kāpālika, approaches king Nala of Niṣadha. In a combat with the Vidūṣaka he drops a portrait of a charming damsel, viz , Damayantī, the daughter of Bhīmaratha, the king of Vidarbha. The king is highly enamoured of the beauty of Damayantī and desires to win her at any cost.

Nala then sends Kalahaṁsa, his friend and Makarikā, a maid, to Damayantī, who go and stimulate in the heart of Damayantī love for Nala Their mission meets with success. Damayantī is also struck with the arrows of cupid. Then in Act III, the king and his party pay a visit to Vidarbha country and meet Damayantī in a garden. In Act IV, there is a poetic description of the Svayaṁvara of Damayantī, which reveals considerable influence of Canto VI of the Raghuvaṁśa. Damayantī is taken from one king to another but finally she puts the garland round the neck of Nala and both are married. Now follows the tragedy of these noble souls. In the beginning of Act V we are told that king Nala loses his kingdom in gambling and leaves it (his kingdom) accompanied by Damayantī only. He then leaves Damayantī alone in the forest. His father who comes to him in the form of a snake bites him and disfigures him. Nala then takes up the job of a cook under Dadhiparṇa, the king of Ayodhyā. Then follows a play within a play (Garbhanāṭaka). The play is named Nalānveṣaṇa. It depicts the condition of Damayantī after she is forsaken by Nala. The role of Damayantī in this Garbhanāṭaka is played by Damayantī herself. Nala often loses consciousness and utters such words as would easily reveal his identity. Soon after we hear that the very next day the king of Vidarbha has arranged for Svayaṁvara of Damayantī, on which occasion Dadhiparṇa is invited. Nala knew Aśvavidyā and consequently they reach Kuṇḍinapura the next morning. While the king is resting Nala moves out and finds that Damayantī is going to plunge herself into fire as she has heard from the travellers that Nala is no more. But then Nala reveals his identity and saves her. Both narrate the account of what they suffered after they were separated. Nala now recovers his kingdom and the drama thus ends on a happy note.

Dr. Keith does not refer to this play nor to the Satyahariścandra.

---

1. Published by G. O. S., Baroda.
2. For a list of Sanskrit works on Nala refer to the Introduction of the Nalavilāsanāṭaka (G. O. S.), pp. 9-10.

Dr. De calls it a laboured composition by one who is well-versed in rules of dramaturgy.

The writer has based his plot mainly upon the story found in the Mahābhārata. Here there is not the slightest trait of fanaticiam nor does the author depend on the story of Nala as found in the Jaina literature.

Rāmacandra has tried to introduce more of realism in the story of the Mahābhārata, which is replete with the supernatural elements. He has removed all possible miraculous elements, such as a message through the swan, Kali's entrance into the body of Nala, birds taking away clothes of Nala, and the like. This was necessary for making the play stageworthy.

Rāmacandra shows a charming sense of discrimination. The deformity of Nala is significantly retained as it forms the most important part of the plot without which the later development of the plot, viz.. the entrance of Bāhuka, Guptavāsa, the unflinching and extraordinary love and loyalty of Damayantī etc., could not have been represented.

The character of Damayantī is depicted far more tenderly than in the Mahābhārata. Kali is ably replaced by Kalacūripati.

2. *Satyahariścandra*[2]

Rāmacandra calls this an Ādi Rūpaka. The play is technically called Nāṭaka, the story being well-known. It is divided into six Acts. The main story deals with the life of ever truthful king Hariścandra. The play opens with the entry of the king who is out on a hunt, and has killed a deer from a hermitage. The hermit Kulapati is very angry on knowing this. The king prepares to submit his entire kingdom to the Kulapati as a compensation for the deer and over and above this, offers one lac of gold coins to Kulapati's daughter Vañcanā whose pet-deer it was.

In Act II Kulapati demands the promised gold of the king and refuses to accept gold from the royal treasury or from queen Sutārā, all of which he claims to be his own along with the kingdom. He asks the king to pay up the gold within a month and quit his territory. People weep and cry at the miserable plight of the king. The queen decides to follow her lord.

Act III depicts the tragedy of this noble soul. The king, the queen, and their son Rohitāśva are on their way to Vārāṇasī. The king is worried about paying the hermit's debt. The queen is sold out as a maid to a merciless Brahmin for 5000 gold coins. Rohitāśva is also purchased by the Brahmin for 1000 gold coins. A Niṣāda comes there and purchases Hariścandra in order to make him a guard of his cemetery. Just then Kulapatī appears and takes away the gold.

1. Vide - History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 465.

2. Edited by B. R. Atre and S. V. Puranik : Published by Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay.

Act IV affords a slight relief. Adbhuta is created by the entry of an enchanter (Māntrika) who brings the queen Sutārā as a demoness. This enchanter reminds us of Bhairavānanda in the Karpūramañjarī, who by his mysterious powers brings the heroine on the stage while she was bathing.

Act V reminds us of the fourth Act of the Nāgānanda where Jīmūtavāhana sacrifices himself to the eagle in order to save Śaṅkhacūda. Here Hariścandra offers himself to Vidyādhara in order to save a prince. Like king Śibi he himself cuts parts of his body and offers them in fire. But Kauṭilya, a pupil of Kulapati, enters and saves the king.

In Act VI we hear of the lamentation of a mother over her son's death. The master of cemetery orders the king to bring the shroud of the corpse. To his utmost surprise and distress the king finds that it is his own son who is bitten by a snake and is now dead. Still however, the king shows no concern and asks for the shroud. Just then the two gods enter and explain that all that has happened is merely to test the mettle of the king. They eulogize him for passing through this ordeal very successfully.

The piece provides an interesting reading. The character of Hariścandra is very well depicted as a high-souled man who prefers death to begging. He refuses to accept food from a kind old woman even when they (i.e. he, his wife and son) are almost dying from hunger. A child of his age, Rāmacandra indulges in much of versification with the result that the natural flow of action is slightly disturbed. In his fondness for the sentiment of wonder he at times, overlooks realism and stage-worthiness of the scenes.

3. *Kaumudīmitrāṇanda*

This is a Prakaraṇa type of drama divided into ten Acts. The work mainly deals with, as the name suggests, the love-story of Mitrāṇanda, the son of a wealthy merchant named Jinasena, the inhabitant of the city of Kautukanagara, and Kaumudī, the daughter of the head of a monastery.

The play opens with the entry of Mitrāṇanda together with his friend Maitreya who are wrecked on an island called Varuṇadvīpa. There they find a damsel enjoying a swing-ride. Both are attracted towards each other. Mitrāṇanda then comes to the Kulapati who apparently receives him very courteously and offers the hand of Kaumudī to him. It is now time for Varuṇa to come and all disperse.

(Act II) Mitrāṇanda then saves a person who is none else but a Siddha king who was nailed by Varuṇa. Varuṇa gives him a divine necklace,

Act III describes a meeting between Mitrāṇanda and Kaumudī who on her part is highly fascinated by the masculine charms of Mitrāṇanda and the charm of that divine necklace and discloses the secret to Mitrāṇanda that Kulapati (her father) and others are not real hermits. The fate of every merchant that married her was that he fell in a well which was concealed under the bed. She, therefore, proposes to flee to Laṅkā and asks Mitrāṇanda to learn the Mantras for snake-bite from her father. The wedding ceremony is performed. Mitrāṇanda learns the Mantras for snake-bite from the Kulapati. The poet very aptly suggests the future events by the verses carrying double meaning.

(Act IV) Mitrānanda and Kaumudī arrive at the capital of Laṅkā named Raṅgaśālā. There on their entry into the city Mitrāṇanda is taken for a theif and is taken round the city seated on an ass, with his body besmeared with red sandal (Raktacandana).

(Act V) Mitrāṇanda is brought before the king. He relates his story. Minister Kāmarati is enamoured of the beauty of Kaumudī and desires her. At this stage a message is brought that the prince is bitten by a snake. Mitrānanda saves the prince from the calamity and is bestowed with honour.

Act VI begins with a Viṣkambhaka. Mitrāṇanda is sent by the king of Ratnapura to be offered as an offering to the lord of Yakṣas (Kubera). Maitreya recognises him and he is saved.

(Act VII) Kaumudī is turned out from the house by the wife of the minister, being suspicious of her husband's ill intentions. She meets Sumitrā, a merchant's daughter, and her family and they fall in the hands of the king of Pallī. In the same way Makaranda, the hero's friend, is also caught by the chief officer of this king and is brought before the king at this juncture. Both Sumitrā and Makaranda are attracted towards each other at the first sight. Just then a message from prince Lakṣmīpati comes asking him to hand over Mitrāṇanda if found by them. Consequently all are recognised and Makaranda is married to Sumitrā.

(Act VIII) Mitrāṇanda, Kaumudī and Sumitrā go to the city of Ekacakrā. There they meet a Kāpālika who treacherously catches young women and sends them to nether world. He wants to kill Mitrāṇanda but the former is caught in his own trap by the Mantra of Makaranda and is killed.

(Act IX) Makaranda had another difficulty. All his 'Sārtha' was claimed by Naradatta, another merchant, and he had to prove before the prince Lakṣmīpati that he was the real owner of the treasure.

Makaranda could prove it but by the trick of Naradatta he was taken as a Mleccha and was to be sent to the gallows. But at the nick of time Vajravarmā and Mitrāṇanda come and Makaranda is saved.

(Act X) Kaumudī and Sumitrā were carried away by the king of Siddhas, but at the eleventh hour Mitrāṇanda and Makaranda are brought and all are happily united.

The name of the author (Rāmacandra) is intelligently suggested by Mudrālaṁkāra.

The play is replete with supernatural atmosphere. The drama obviously lacks humour and in order to compensate for this deficiency the poet seems to have introduced the sentiment of wonder (Adbhuta Rasa) in all abundance.

" The story resembles those of Daṇḍin's Daśakumāracarita and the author might have done well if he had attempted to write in the same strain and form; for there is not much merit in the play as a dramatic piece, nor is it remarkable on the poetic side."[1] "It is typical of the later play of this kind in having a complicated series of narrative, rather than dramatic incidents. "[2] Dr. Keith points out that the work is wholly undramatic and is really the working up in the form of a play of a number of Kathā incidents, presenting a result not unlike the plot of a modern pantomime."[3] In the same strain he adds, " The work is of course wholly without interest other than that presented by so many marvels appealing to the sentiment of wonder in the audience."[4]

Thus Kaumudīmitrāṇanda on the whole does not make a very impressive drama or a specially noteworthy specimen of the class of Prakaraṇas as one finds there a mere assemblage of many incidents and motifs of wonder and danger.[5]

4. *Nirbhayabhīmavyāyoga*[6]

This is a small one-act play technically known as Vyāyoga. The story is based on one incident found in the Mahābhārata. Here Bhīma saves a Brahmin youth from the clutches of the demon, Baka. The scene starts with the lamentation of the mother and the young wife of the Brahmin youth. Bhīma comes there and resolves to save the Brahmin by sacrificing his own person.

1. History of Sanskrit Literature (De & Dasgupta), p. 476
2. Ibid., p 475.
3. Sanskrit Drama, p. 258.
4. Ibid., p. 259.
5. The Social Play in Sanskrit, p. 12.
6. The work has been edited by Shri Hargovinddas and Shri Bechardas published by Dharmābhyudaya Press, Benares in Veer Era 2437.

Draupadī is so much overpowered with grief and dejection that she tries to hang herself up. Just at that time Yudhiṣṭhira arrives accompanied by Arjuna, Nakula and Sahadeva. Draupadī is released and soon Bhīma arrives after killing the demon. The Brahmin showers blessings upon Bhīma and the play ends.

The early scene of the play reminds us of Act V of the Nāgānanda. The lamentations of the mother and the wife of the victim are very similar to those of the Nāgānanda of Harṣa. Rāmacandra seems also to have been influenced by the Madhyamavyāyoga of Bhāsa, which also has a similar theme. (Though the incidents are different the hero in both is the middle one of the Pāṇḍavas i. e. Bhīma).

The style of the play is lucid and simple. The vigorous sentiment is aptly developed. The lamentations of the mother and the wife are highly pathetic and heart-rending. The beginning of the play is also dramatic and the interest is sustained throughout. The play provides a fairly interesting reading.

Dr. Keith simply mentions this work and points out that it should belong to the second half of the twelth century.[1] He offers no comments on the literary worth of the play.

5. *Raghuvilāsa*

The Raghuvilāsa is one of those plays of Rāmacandra, which he has cited most in his Naṭyadarpaṇa. In the prologue, the Raghuvilāsa refers to five works (*Pañcaprabandha*) of Rāmacandra viz., the Dravyālaṁkāra, the Rāghavābhyudaya, the Yādavābhyudaya, the Nalavilāsanāṭaka and the Raghuvilāsa. He calls himself as well-versed in the three lores and says that he is a vigilant poet.[2] He also calls himself Sāhityopaniṣadvid.[3] The author praises his speech thus:

"Rāma's speech is sweet. There was no sweetness before him, otherwise the gods should not have churned the ocean for nectar." (I, 5)

The story starts with Rāma going to the forest with Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa to honour the word of Daśaratha.

In Act II we find Rāvaṇa moving in the aerial car with his party. He is bewitched by the enchanting beauty of Sītā. He approaches Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā in the guise of Virādha, the son of Candrodara, the king of Pātālalaṅkā, who was killed by Rāvaṇa. Shortly afterwards an entry of the demons is suggested. Lakṣmaṇa goes to destroy them. Rāma

1. Cf. Sanskrit Drama, p. 266.
2. Raghuvilāsa, I, 3.
3. ibid. I, 4.

goes to assist Lakṣmaṇa, leaving Sītā alone. In the meanwhile, Rāvaṇa takes Sītā away in his aerial car. Jaṭāyu, a bird-friend of Rāma, sacrifices his life in his attempt to save Sītā.

In Act III we find Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa coming back. Rāma pitiably laments the loss of Sītā. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa then come to Jaṭāyu and realize that Sītā must have been carried away by Rāvaṇa. Here too Rāvaṇa, disguised as Virādha, comes there and asks Rāma to return to him his wife Patralekhā who was kept with him for safe custody. Rāma is taken aback. At the same time a Vidyādhara comes and the demon disappears. He comes from Hanūmat by the order of Sugrīva, and reports what has happened to Sītā. Rāma asks him why he had been to Hanūmat, whereupon he points out that a Vidyādhara having assumed the form of Sugrīva stays in Kiṣkindhā with a view to enjoying Tārā and ever since that time Sugrīva stays outside the town being daily defeated by the Vidyādhara owing to his superior strength and so Sugrīva had sent him to Hanūmat for help. Rāma resolves to kill that imposter of Sugrīva.

Act IV takes us to the metropolis of Rāvaṇa. We see Rāvaṇa trying to win the love of Sītā. But Sītā is firm like a rock. Rāvaṇa tries many tricks and frauds but ultimately fails to win over Sītā.

In Act V Vibhīṣaṇa tries to advise Rāvaṇa but his advice is spurned. He, therefore, goes out and joins Rāma. Then comes Candrarāśi[1], the son of Vālin, with a message from Rāma. Rāvaṇa by his Māyā shows him that Pavanañjaya, the father of Hanūmat, also serves him and that Sītā also ardently loves him. The messenger goes back and at the end the battle between Rāma, Sugrīva and his party on one hand and Kuṁbhakarṇa, Indrajit and the demons on the other starts.

In Act VI we hear further accounts of the battle. Kuṁbhakarṇa and Indrajit are captured. Lakṣmaṇa is hurt by Rāvaṇa with his missile. Lakṣmaṇa becomes senseless. All are greatly perturbed but at last a Vidyādhara comes and suggests that if the water by which Viśalyā, the daughter of Droṇaghana, the brother of Kaikeyī, bathes is sprinkled over the body of the prince before sunrise then he will be instantaneously brought back to his senses. Hanūmat, Aṅgada and others immediately proceed to bring it.

In Act VII Maya comes with Mandodarī and Mārīca to persuade Rāvaṇa to leave his infatuation for Sītā but all to no purpose. Rāvaṇa makes up his mind to fight with Rāma to the last.

In the Viṣkaṁbhaka of Act VIII we learn that Rāvaṇa tries by his sorcery various tricks to capture Sītā's heart. Rāvaṇa then comes face

1. According to Vālmīki he is Aṅgada

to face with Rāma and Lakṣmana in the battlefield and has to settle the account finally. Rāma and Rāvaṇa enter into a combat. In the meanwhile Rāvaṇa plays another Māyā trick. Janaka, the father of Sītā, informs Sītā of the death of Rāma, hearing which Sītā is shocked, and prepares to plunge herself into fire to follow Rāma. But Hanūmat comes at the nick of time and informs Rāma of the same. All hasten to the place to save Sītā. Death of Rāvaṇa is suggested from 'Nepathya'. The play comes to a close by the happy reunion of Rāma and Sītā. Jāmbavanta recites the final blessings.

The story of Rāma has been differently treated as compared to the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. Here Rāmacandra seems to have followed the narrative of the Jain Rāmāyaṇas. There also the writer tries to give a touch of freshness to the story by inventing some novel episodes. The 'Apaharaṇa' of Sītā is delineated in a different way altogether. The entire episode of Rāvaṇa approaching Rāma in disguise seems to be the invention of the poet and is highly interesting and dramatic. But the beauty of the situations is often marred by the unnecessary preponderance of lengthy verses which interrupt the natural flow of the narrative.

The lamentation of Rāma over the loss of Sītā is poetic and shows the influence of Kalīdāsa's Vikramorvaśīya where the hero in search of his beloved addresses different animate and inanimate objects of nature.

The play abounds in the supernatural elements as the demons do possess supernatural powers such as assuming different forms, disappearing all of a sudden, etc. The dramatist has made the best use of the supernatural (magic, sorcery, etc.) in increasing the suspense.

There is an extract of the Raghuvilāsanāṭaka - the *Raghuvilāsanāṭakoddhāra* - by some unknown writer, where he has abridged the original play by nearly one half. Here what the writer has done is to do away with the prose - portion where-ever possible and retain simply the verses. In Act IV three verses which are not in the original are added.

Extracts of these types may suggest the popularity of the original work. Moreover they also shed some light on the concept of drama in those days. In fact the charm of a dramatic piece lies in its forceful dialogues. But here we find that there was a class of people which was more interested in the lyrical verses of the play rather than in its dialogue. Exuberence of verses which we look upon today as an artistic fault in drama was at one time the chief cause of attraction in a play.

6. *Mallikāmakaranda*

The beginning of the play is dramatic. In the dead of night a woman comes to the temple of Cupid and tries to hang herself. She is a princess

named Mallikā. Makaranda, the hero, immediately rushes in and saves her. Both are smitten by the arrows of cupid. Makaranda inquires of her troubles. Mallikā gives him the pair of her ear ornaments.

In Act II we find Makaranda captured by the gamblers. The so-called merchant father of Mallikā - the real daughter of Candralekhā, the queen of a Vidyādhara king named Vainateya - releases Makaranda from the clutches of the gamblers by paying off his debt. The merchant tells Makaranda how he had found Mallikā sixteen years ago when she was a newly born child lying in the grove of Mallikā trees. She had rings with the seal of Vainateya on her fingers and a Bhūrja-leaf in her hair, where it was written, "After sixteen years, on the fourteenth day of the dark half of Caitra, I will forcibly carry her away having killed her husband and her protector." Makaranda resolves to save her. But at the end of the Act we find Mallikā carried away by some mysterious being.

Act III relates the incidents in the kingdom of Vidyādharas where Mallikā was carried. Mallikā refuses to marry Citrāṅgada, the Vidyādhara prince. Makaranda's arrival here infuriates Candralekhā, the mother of Mallikā.

(Act IV) Mallikā is under the strict supervision of Candralekhā. Makaranda is utterly dejected with all his hopes shattered. He then comes across a parrot who narrates his story to him and is then turned into man by the touch of Makaranda. He is Vaiśravaṇa, a sea-trader of Vaibhala city. He was on his voyage with his wife Manoramā. On his way he met an aged lady who invited him for amorous dalliance. But he refused whereupon he was turned into a parrot. His wife was kept as a servant to her daughter. This aged lady was none but Candralekhā (the mother of Mallikā) who lived the life of an unchaste woman and stayed in the hermitage of Gandhamūṣikā, a nun. Makaranda then meets Citrāṅgada and is captured by his men.

In Act V, Vaiśravaṇa and Manoramā resolve to help Makaranda in his task. Mallikā expresses her unflinching love for Makaranda to her mother and afterwards to Citrāṅgada.

The Viṣkambhaka of Act VI tells us that Mallikā showed her love and affection for Citrāṅgada in stead of Makaranda. But in fact this affection was simply a trick to win the confidence of Citrāṅgada. In the Act we learn that according to the orders of Gandhamūṣikā before the actual marriage of Citrāṅgada and Mallikā could take place there was another marriage ceremony of the bride and Yakṣādhirāja, to be performed in accordance with the usual custom. The marriage between the Yakṣādhirāja and Mallikā is complete. But this Yakṣādhirāja turns out

to be Makaranda himself. Ultimately all give their consent to the marriage and the play ends with a happy union.

The dramatist suggests his name at the end by means of Mudrālaṁkāra.

In the prologue the author calls it Nāṭaka.[1] But, in fact, it is a Prakaraṇa as the story is purely imaginary. Even in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa Rāmacandra refers to it as a Prakarana[2]. Usually the Prakaraṇas have ten Acts but here there are only six.

The work is quoted only once in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa. It is a Śuddha type of Prakaraṇa.

7. *Rohiṇīmṛgāṅka*

The third Prakaraṇa of Rāmacandra about which very little is known is the *Rohinīmṛgāṅka* which is obviously an imaginary story of love between Rohiṇī and Mṛgāṅka. The work has still to be discovered. The two quotations from the work, that we find in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa[3], do not help us in any way in getting an idea of the plot.

8. *Rāghavābhyudaya*

It is a Nāṭaka based in the story of Rāma. The work is not extant.

Rāmacandra quotes the work ten times in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa. The Bṛhaṭṭipaṇikā refers to this work as a play of Rāmacandra composed in ten Acts.

As we have already seen, the Raghuvilāsa a based on the story of Rāma. Even though the Rāghavābhyudaya is is not extant, from the quotations that we get in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa it is evident that both the Rāghuvilāsa and the Rāghavābhyudaya deal with almost the same period of Rāma's life. The Raghuvilāsa begins with Rāma leaving for the forest along with Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa, while the Rāghavābhyudaya seems to open with the Svayaṁvara of Sītā,[4] of course, the later development of the story of the Rāghavābhyudaya is likely to have much in common with the Raghuvilāsa. The Rāghavābhyudaya was written earlier than the Raghuvilāsa, for in the prologue to the Raghuvilāsa it has been mentioned as one of the five excellent works of Rāmacandra.

1. Here the term Nāṭaka seems to have been loosely used in the sense of "play" and not in its technical sense.
2. Nāṭyadarpaṇa, p. 171.
3. Nāṭyadarpaṇa, pp. 61, 68.
4. This may be under the influence of Bhavabhūti who also wrote two works on the story of Rāma. But while Bhavabhūti treats of two different stages in the life of Rāma in the two plays (one before coronation and the other after coronation) Rāmacandra does not seem to have done so.

9. *Yādavābhyudaya*

The work is not extant. It has been quoted eight times in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa. The work depicts the life of Krishna mainly dealing with the destruction of Kaṁsa, Jarāsaṁdha and others and ends with Krishna's coronation.

The work is mentioned in the prologue to the Raghuvilāsa along with the Rāghavābhyudaya as one of the five excellent works of Rāmacandra.

It appears that the work was in about ten Acts.[1]

The dramatist has cleverly put his name in the concluding verse of the play with the help of Mudrālaṁkāra.[2]

The work shows Rāmacandra's fondness for generalizations.

10. *Vanamālā*

Rāmacandra has also written a Nāṭikā called *Vanamālā*. Nothing is known about the plot of the play. It has been quoted only once in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa which consists of the speech of the king (probably Nala) addressed to Damayantī who is probably angry with him for his infidelity towards her.

The story seems to describe the love - affair between king Nala and Vanamālā who must have been the heroine of the play.[3] The hero must have been Nala, the celebrated king of the past, and the plot must have been as usual (mostly on the pattern of the Nāṭikās of Harṣa), viz., the hero secretly makes love to the heroine, the elderly queen resents this and tries to put obstacles in the way but ultimately she consents to the union of the hero with the heroine. This Nāṭikā also appears to have a similar plot where Damayantī, the elderly queen of the hero, first resents the king's making love to another woman but afterwards agrees to the union.

(B) *Poems of Rāmacandra*

1. *Kumāravihāraśataka*

This is a Khaṇḍakāvya. It is in praise of Kumāravihāra, a temple constructed by Kumārapāla of Caulukya dynasty, the king of Gujarat in Aṇahilapura Pāṭaṇa. The poem consists of 116 verses in all.

---

1. Its title is similar to that of the Rāghavābhyudaya (Acts ten). The Nāṭyadarpaṇa quotes some lines from Act VII of the Yādavābhyudaya to illustrate Saṁpheta, a limb of Avamarśa Sandhi (p. 94).
2. Vide Nāṭyadarpaṇa, p. 115.
3. It is customary to name a Nāṭikā after the heroine, e.g., the Ratnāvalī, the Priyadarśikā, the Karpūrasundarī (of Bilhaṇa) and others. Hence it is quite reasonable to suppose that Rāmacandra should have followed the same.

The poem starts with the offering of salutation to Pārśva, one of the twenty four Tīrthaṅkaras, who is adored in the first eight verses in the Sragdharā metre.

In the remaining 108 verses the poet very enthusiastically describes the temple. The poet has very vividly and poetically described the richness and splendour, the glory and grandeur of the sacred temple. The poet graphically describes how people thronged in millions so that it was difficult to move about. The inner walls were made of gold and were studded with precious stones of various kinds. The idol of Pārśva was made of a very precious moon-stone. There were various colourful pictures and images on the walls. It was decorated with gold jars. It also contained innumerable pillars made of precious stones. The charming young damsels used to dance before the Lord Jina in the temple. The goddeses used to play there. Auspicious songs were used to be sung. Bards used to recite poems. Alms were given to hundreds of beggars who gathered there. Sweet notes of various musical instruments were heard, and so on.

In the concluding verse the poet says, "What to talk of a man whose intellect is naturally impure, but even Brahman endowed with divine vision cannot describe with all his four mouths the richness of the beauty of this temple (Kumāravihāra), as illustrious Pārśvanātha, who has annihilated all desires, and who is a moon to the garden of moon-lotuses in the form of the three worlds, has made an abode here, even though he has attained the highest abode (i. e., salvation) which constitutes supreme meditation."

Here Rāmacandra has skilfully suggested his authorship by bringing in his name with the help of Mudrālaṁkāra A commentary (called Avacūrṇi) has been written on the poem by Sudhābhūṣaṇa gaṇi, the pupil of Vivekasāgara gaṇi.

In his preface the editor of the Kumāravihāraśaṭaka remarks that the beauty of poetry that we see in this poem is of an excellent type in the whole of the Jaina literature. In this work we find that the words and the sense combine gracefully. Rāmacandra uses the choicest words and they give rise to a variety of senses. The work gives a graphic picture of the temple. Rāmacandra deserves congratulations for such an excellent literary creation.

The poem is mainly composed in Sragdharā metre which is often interspersed with Vasantatilakā and Śārdūlavikrīdita.

The poem has been adorned with various 'figures of words' such as Anuprāsa, Yamaka, Śleṣa etc. and 'figures of sense' such as Upamā, Utprekṣā, Bhrāntimān and others.

The poem testifies to the poetic imagination of Rāmacandra.

2. *Sudhākalaśa*

This work is not published. It is a poem written mostly in Prakrit. It has been quoted three times in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa.[1] It is difficult to assert the exact nature of the work, but from the illustrations quoted in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the title of the work which means "a jar or treasure of nectar" it appears to be a work containing Śubhāṣitas on miscellaneous subjects.[3]

The work suggests that Rāmacandra had perfect mastery not only over Sanskrit but over Prakrit as well.

3. *Dodhakapañcaśatī*

It is difficult to ascertain the precise nature of this work which is not extant. A reference to the work is found in Purātanaprabandhasaṅgraha (p. 49) wherein it is stated that Rāmacandra refuses to impart knowledge to Bālacandra in spite of strict orders from Ajayapāla to do so. He prefers death to submission. He therefore cuts his tongue and terminates his life. At this time he composes this work. Evidently it is the last work of Rāmacandra and must have been composed of five hundred verses in Dodhaka metre, as can be easily inferred from the title of the work. It is probable that here Rāmacandra must have given free vent to his personal emotions and ideas, his ideals and his undaunted fearlessness to call a spade a spade.

(C) *Stotras of Rāmacandra*

Rāmacandra, a religious preacher as he was, has written a number of Stotras out of which the following have been published.

1. *Apahnutidvātriṁśikā*

It consists of thirty two verses composed in Vaṁśastha metre, in praise of Lord Jina.

Here the figure Apahnuti is present in almost all verses.

2. *Arthāntaranyāsadvātriṁśikā*

Here in thirty two verses the poet eulogises Pārśvanātha,[2] the twenty third Tīrthaṁkara of the Jainas. The figure that is underlying almost all the verses is Arthāntaranyāsa. The metre is Vaṁśastha.

---

1. Vide Nāṭyadarpaṇa, pp. 147, 148, 165.
2. Pārśvanātha has a special place among the twenty four Tīrthaṁkaras. Like Mahāvīra he was historical while others before him are rather mythical or legendary. Pārśva became very popular with the masses. He strove hard for the uplift of the Nāga tribe of people (near Assam) and that is why probably he bears the emblem of Nāga (cobra).
3. The Bṛhaṭṭipaṇikā also refers to the Sudhākalaśa as a Subhāṣitakośa composed by Rāmacandra. Vide Nalavilāsa (Intro.), p. 33.

The poet gives here some of the very charming generalizations such as "Wonderful are the deeds of the high-souled ones"[1], "The prosperity of the good destroys the calamity of the world",[2] etc.

3. *Vyatirekadvātriṁśikā*

This again is a Stotra in praise of Pārśvanātha by resorting to the figure Vyatireka. Here Pārśva is shown as superior to Śaṁkara, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Gaṇeśa, Kārtikeya, Buddha, moon, etc.

The Metre used is Drutavilambita.

4. *Śrīmuuisuvratadevastava*

This is a Stotra in praise of Muni Suvratadeva, one of the twenty four Tīrthaṅkaras, in twenty four verses in Vasantatilakā metre.

5. *Śrīnemijinastava*

In twenty four verses the poet adores another Tīrthaṅkara of the Jainas, viz., Neminātha

6. *Jinastutidvātriṁśikā*

This Stotra consists of thirty two verses composed in Vasantatilakā (excluding the last one which is composed in Mandākrāntā) in general praise of the Jaina Tīrthaṅkaras. The poet has decorated this Stotra with an abundant use of similes.

7. *Dṛṣṭāntagarbhastutidvātriṁśikā*

In this Stotra the poet offers worship to Jina in thirty two verses. Practically, every verse contains a Dṛṣṭānta.

8. *Śrīyugādidevadvātriṁśikā*

In these thirty two verses the deity worshipped is Yugādideva i.e. Ṛṣabhadeva, the first among the Tīrthankaras. Most of the verses are composed in Vaṁśasthavila metre.

9. *Śāntidvātriṁśikā*

This is in praise of a Tīrthankara named Śāntinātha. It is also composed in Vaṁśastha metre.

The Stotra that is available is incomplete as we get only twenty eight verses out of the thirty two.

10. *Bhaktyatiśayadvātriṁśikā*

The whole Stotra is in the Upajāti metre and is in praise of Pārśvanātha.

11. *Prasādadvātriṁśikā*

This Stotra again is in praise of Pārśvanātha. The poet with fervent

---

1. चित्रमेव चरितं महात्मनाम् । — Verse 1
2. विश्वदुर्गतिहृतः श्रियः सताम् । — Verse 30

devotion describes the greatness of the grace (Prasāda) of Pārśva. All the verses are in Mandākrāntā metre.

12-28. *Ṣoḍaśikāḥ Sādhāraṇajinastavāḥ*

Under this common heading there are 17 Stotras having 16 verses each. The first out of these is different from the remaining sixteen so far as the metre is concerned. It is composed in various metres. The last verse suggests the name of the author by Mudrālaṁkāra. All the remaining sixteen are composed in Anuṣṭubh metre excluding the last verse which runs in all these sixteen Stotras as follows :-

स्वामिन्ननन्तफलकल्पतरोऽभिराम चन्द्रावदातचरिताञ्चितविश्वचक्र ।
शक्रस्तुताङ्घ्रिसरसीरुह दुःस्थसार्थे देव प्रसीद करुणां कुरु देहि दृष्टिम् ॥

These sixteen Stotras are in praise of the Tīrthaṅkaras in general.

Rāmacandra was a Jaina monk. His chief occupation in life was, therefore, to preach and practise law and religion. His Stotras reveal his ardent devotion and unflinching faith in his own religion.

The total number of Stotras that he has written is considerably large. All the Stotras go to indicate his appreciable command over language and grammar. His vocabulary is very vast.

His knowledge of the science of rhetorics is quite evident from some of his Stotras which are wholly based on the figures of speech such as Apahnuti, Dṛṣṭānta, Arthāntaranyāsa, Upamā, Vyatireka and others.

The choice of metres is also happy and appropriate to the sentiment. The poet has used a variety of metres such as Anuṣṭubh, Mandākrāntā, Vasantatilakā, Vaṁśastha, Upajāti, Drutavilaṁbita, etc.

Rāmacandra seems to have a fascination for the multiple of eight, viz., 16, 24, and 32, especially for the number 32 since most of his Stotras are Dvātriṁśikās.

The verses of Rāmacandra are in the graceful and lucid Vaidarbhī style.

A critical evaluation of Rāmacandra's art

A vast number of works that Rāmacandra has written clearly indicates the zeal and diligence of the writer. He must have been highly industrious in order to make such a voluminous contribution.

Moreover, Rāmacandra has not remained content with attempting only one or two forms of literature. He is a poet as well as a dramatist. He has written a number of Stotras in praise of Jinas which are replete with ardent devotion. His Śataka in praise of the temple constructed by his patron Kumārapāla is also well-known. He has tried his hand

1. Vide Jainastotrasaṁgraha, stotras 61-77.

at various types of Rūpakas. He has contributed not less than three Prakaraṇas. He has also written Nāṭaka, Nāṭikā, Vyāyoga, etc.

Rāmacandra is a conscious artist. Like his great predecessor Bhavabhūti he is always conscious of his art and erudition. He thinks rather highly of himself and often indulges in self-eulogy. There is not a single work in which he does not speak of his greatness and merits. Here he presents a strong contrast with a dramatist like Kālidāsa who is so very modest. In the Nalavilāsa he refers to himself as a poet who is the singular abode of charming (Sarasa) speech.[1] Expert as he is in the depiction of varied sentiments which the Indian theorists reckon to be the soul of drama, he considers himself to be superior to other playwrights such as Murāri and others who are satisfied merely with striking modes of speech.[2] He is proud of his writings which afford more and more charm if read over and over again as against the works of others which gradually lose their charm if read again and again.[3]

The plays of Rāmacandra do exhibit his mastery over the science of drama. It appears that the playwright is fully conversant with the nature and technique of Sanskrit drama. He purposefully introduces the different types of Sandhyangas in order to bring strikingness and novelty in the plot. In the prologue to the Raghuvilāsa, Rāmacandra prides himself on the fact that his plays are embellished by the use of the Sandhyaṅgas, which is also evident from the number of quotations that he cites from his plays in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa to illustrate the various Sandhyaṅgas. Moreover, he has often introduced various Vīthyaṅgas to render the speech or the dialogue more effective.[4] The different parts of the plot are well-connected. The incidents appear to be naturally arising from the earlier ones.

The plot is well-knit, which indicates his deep knowledge about the Sandhis, Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis, etc.

Rāmacandra has also skilfully used the Patākāsthānakas, e. g., in the Raghuvilāsa, Sītā says, "I will enjoy the three worlds after being the queen of Laṅkā by the prowess (lit. favour) of my lord." and the very moment a voice comes from behind the scenes, "There is no doubt about this."

Rāmacandra is a talented artist. He is endowed with the creative faculty, which the Sanskrit theorists call Pratibhā, which is indispensable for any artist.

1. कविः काव्ये रामः सरसवचसामेकवसतिः । — Nalavilāsa I, 2.
2. ibid., I, 3.
3. ibid., I, 4.
4. For illustrations, vide Nāṭyadarpaṇa, pp. 135-148.

Like most other dramatists of Sanskrit literature Rāmacandra also resorts to history or mythology for the plot of his plays. But after taking the outline from the historical works (especially the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata) he develops the plot in his own way making necessary alterations, additions and omissions in keeping with the sentiment to be depicted and characters to be delineated, e. g. in the Raghuvilāsa he introduces considerable changes and modifications in the original story so that the story appears to be novel; similarly in the Nalavilāsa good many changes are introduced from an artistic and dramatic point of view.

Rāmacandra seems to be very fond of Subhāṣitas which are often used in all of his plays. In the prologue to the Nirbhayabhīma he refers to his Subhāṣitas as 'showers of joy'.[1]

Rāmacandra looks upon Rasa as the soul of dramatic perfomance.[2]

The influence of the preceding dramatists on Rāmacandra

In the Nāṭyadarpaṇa, Rāmacandra confesses in the introductory verses that he has well studied the works of the great poets.[3] The plays of Rāmacandra fully support this statement as we find considerable influence of the preceding poets on the dramatic art and technique of the writer. The dramatists who seem to have highly influenced Rāmacandra are Bhāsa, Śūdraka, Kālidāsa, Harṣa and Bhavabhūti.

The introductory scene from the Rāghavābhyudaya where Sītā mistakes Rāma for Cupid shows the influence of the Ratnāvalī of Harṣa, where Sāgarikā mistakes Udayana to be Cupid (Act I).

Among the dramatists who had considerable influence on Rāmacandra, Bhavabhūti appears to be the most outstanding, whose influence is visible in his Prakaraṇas as well as in his Rāma-plays. Three of Rāmacandra's plays are Prakaraṇas. Here Rāmacandra seems to have been considerably influenced by Bhavabhūti whose Mālatīmādhava must have been a model for Rāmacandra, even though in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa he apparently criticizes the work for employing Kaiśikī in exuberance.[4]

The exuberance of verses may also indicate the influence of Bhavabhūti and other playwrights (such as Rājaśekhara, Murāri and others).

The influence of Kālidāsa whom most of the later dramatists tried to imitate with little success also is to be seen at a few places. The beginning of the Raghuvilāsa with a song reminds us of the Abhijñāna-

1. op. cit., 1, 2.
2. रसप्राणो नाट्यविधिः । — Nalavilāsa, p. 77.
3. महाकविनिबद्धानि दृष्ट्वा रूपाणि भूरिशः । — Nāṭyadarpaṇa, p. 23.
4. ibid., p. 120.

Śākuntala which has a similar type of beginning. Similarly Act IV of the Nalavilāsa where Mādhavasenā takes Damayantī round the Svayaṁvara-maṇḍapa before every king and glorifies him, shows the influence of the scene of Indumatīsvayaṁvara in the Raghuvaṁśa of Kālidāsa.

The use of the split-up verses[1] that we occasionally find in the plays of Rāmacandra can also be taken as the influence of Bhāsa in whose plays we find them abundantly used.[2]

As a dramatist Rāmacandra has his limitations also. The influence of the decadent period of Sanskrit drama is observed here too, the early germs of which are seen in the works of Bhavabhūti. The playwright does not leave any opportunity of exhibiting his fondness for poetry. We find a number of lyrical or descriptive verses intermixed with prose dialogues. The style also is ornate and artificial. If we look at the whole range of Sanskrit dramatic literature after Bhavabhūti we find that drama was getting poorer and poorer so far as dramatic element was concerned. The gulf between Sanskrit and Prakrit was widening day by day. The practice of staging Sanskrit dramas was decreasing as the people who could understand and appreciate Sanskrit were becoming fewer and fewer. The dramatic literature could not be free from the social, political and cultural influence of the times.

The dramas were now ceased to be written from the view point of the spectators (i.e, general masses). They were usually meant to be read by the learned pandits and hence the poetic element assumed greater importance. The two of the celebrated representatives of this time are Murāri and Rājaśekhara whose dramas are the models, as it were, of ornate and artificial style. Rāmacandra could not but be influenced by his age, and we find him often indulging in composition of ornate and artificial verses in lengthy metres like Śārdūlavikrīḍita, Sragdharā and others.

Preponderance of verses may be taken to-day as an artistic fault as far as drama is concerned. But it appears that in the particular age the practice of using verses was current and the audience did enjoy it.[3] In fact, according to the Indian theory of aesthetics a dramatist does not differ very much from a poet. A dramatist has to be a poet first and a

1. Vide Raghuvilāsa V, 33; VII, 31.
2. Such split-up verses are also found in the Mṛcchakaṭika of Śūdraka but that too suggests the influence of Bhāsa.
3. This reminds the present writer of some old dramas in Gujarati which he witnessed in his early age and which consisted of ample number of verses that were recited vigorously in keeping with the sentiment and were highly appreciated by the audience.

dramatist afterwards.[1] Rāmacandra's genius also is more of a poet than of a dramatist.

Here Rāmacandra seems to have ignored his own statement in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa that the plot of a drama should have less of verses as the sense when conveyed through prose becomes easier to grasp[2]. But preaching is different from practice. Even then it should be noted to the credit of Rāmacandra that his verses are usually simple and lucid (Prasannārtha). Moreover, like Bhavabhūti, Rāmacandra also believes in forceful expression rather than silent suggestion which is the soul of poetry according to Sanskrit critics[3] and which is the secret of the dramatic art of Kālidāsa, the greatest of our Indian poets.[4]

In the drama of Rāmacandra we usually find a lack of delightful humour which we find in the plays of Kālidāsa or in the Mṛcchakaṭika of Śūdraka. All the three Prakaraṇas uniformly lack in this element of humour which the poet tries to compensate for by introducing the sentiment of wonder. In this respect Rāmacandra may be compared with Bhavabhūti who also does not provide us with refreshing humour - the deficiency which is very obvious in his Mālatīmādhava and which he tries to compensate for by introducing the sentiment of wonder in abundance. It is quite likely that such an attitude on the part of this young dramatist may be as a result of Bhavabhūti's influence or that it may be due to his monastic way of life which is full of seriousness, serenity and austerity. This particular mental attitude becomes evident even when he says that humour, sorrow and fear are meant for children, fools and women.[5]

Still however, Rāmacandra is not incapable of creating humour. In the Nalavilāsa he has introduced the element of humour to some extent. The chief source of humour here is the Vidūṣaka. He makes fun of every body. He laughs at Lambodara by pointing out that his name was quite appropriate to his form.[6] He is a great devotee of his wife's feet.[7] The memory of his wife's feet could inspire courage and fearlessness in his

---

1. Cf. Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists, p. 27.
2. Vide स्वल्पपद्यं लघुगद्यं etc. (op. cit., I, 14) and the Vṛtti over it.
3. Cf. ध्वनिरात्मा काव्यस्य — ध्वन्यालोक १, १.
4. कविकुलगुरुः कालिदासो विलासः । — प्रसन्नराघव १, २२.
5. बाला मूर्खाः स्त्रियश्चैव हास्यशोकभयादिषु । — नाट्यदर्पण, पृ. १२६
6. आणिदीए सरिसं णाम । — नलविलास, पृ० ८
7. किंतु गरुअभिअअंसणीए चलणाण संभरिअं । — ibid., p. 5

heart.[1] He cuts even indecent jokes at Lambastanī.[2] He advises Lambastanī to sit carefully on the chair as it was too weak to bear her burden.[3] He also inquires sarcastically why she has become to much emaciated. He blesses Makarikā that she may receive a handsome mate like himself and further asks her whether Damayantī inquired about him.[4] Thus the Vidūṣaka makes an important contribution in relieving the spectators of the seriousness by his fun and frolic. The character of Lambastanī tries to create humour by her peculiar gestures and speech.

The humour of the Vidūṣaka and Lambastanī is often coarse and stereotyped. But Rāmacandra has created finer humour also. The example of Pragamana quoted in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa from the Nalavilāsa is a very fine example of such witty humour.[5]

Rāmacandra has not the slightest of fanaticism. Even though a Jaina he has equal regard for Hinduism. Most of his plays such as the Raghuvilāsa, the Nalavilāsa, the *Satyahariścandra* the *Nirbhayabhīma*, the Rāghavābhyudaya, the Yādavābhyudaya, etc. are based on the story of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, the two of the Hindu epics.[6]

---

1. नियबभणीचलणसमरणेण नट्ठ मह भयं । – ibid, p. 7
2. जइ एसा थूलमहिसी कडियड नच्चावंती ममोवरि पडेदि, ता धुव म मारेदि । —ibid, p. 24
3. ...... दुब्बलं खु एद आसण । ता तुमए सावहाणाए उवविसियव्वं । —ibid., p 24
4. मम सरिसं रूविणं पइं लहसु । ... ताए कभगाए मह वत्ता कावि पुच्छिदा । —ibid., p. 17
5. (अ) दमयन्ती — जइ एवं ता मुंच मे पाणिं ।

   नल :— कथमपराधकारी मुच्यते ?

   दमयन्ती — किं एदिणा अवरद्धं ?

   राजा — अनेन त्वत्प्रतिकृतिमालिख्यायमियति विरहानले पातितः ।

   दमयन्ती — (स्मित्वा) जइ एव ता अह पि ते पाणिं गहिस्सं । तव पाणिलिहिदेण पडेण अहं पि एदावत्थसरीरा जादा । — नलविलास, पृ० ३९

   नाट्यदर्पण, पृ० ७९

   (ब) दमयन्ती — (प्रकाशम्) कविंजल्ले ! को एस मं वारेइ ?

   कपिञ्जला — जस्स कदे तुमं इध समागदा ।

   दमयंन्ती — कस्स कदे अहं इध समागदा ?

   कपिञ्जला — हिययदइयस्स ।

   दमयन्ती — ता किं भयवं मणसिजो ?

   कपिञ्जला — (विहस्य) भट्टिणी जाणादि । — नलविलास, पृ० ३८
6. Here it should be noted that the Jainas have never felt ashamed of borrowing whatever good they found in the Hindu literature - religious or secular. Thus the Jainas have their own Rāmāyana and they look upon Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa as a distorted version of the real story of Rāma but it should be pointed out that in the story depicted by Rāmacandra there is nothing which can be called Jinistic.

His outlook is wide and not guided by religious propensities even though his religious attitude becomes occasionly known by his conscious or unconscious cutting references to the various peculiarities of the Hindu religion or the Brahmin class.

Rāmacandra, at times, taunts the Hindu religion. He sarcastically refers to the three great gods of Hindus, viz., Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śaṅkara as all of them are married and have not been able to conquer passion (which, according to the Jainas, is the root cause of all misery) as against the Tīrthankaras who are celebates.[1] In the Nalavilāsa Rāmacandra ridicules the low mentality and the greed of the Brahmins.[2] In the Kaumudīmitrāṇanda there is an outright condemnation of Hiṁsā or violence.[3]

There are certain characters which are common in more plays than one, e g., the character of Laṁbastanī is to be found in the Nalavilāsa, the Satyahariścandra and the Kaumudīmitrāṇanda. The character of Ghoraghoṇa is found in the Nalavilāsa as well as the Kaumudīmitrāṇanda.

There are certain verses also which are common to some of the plays.[4]

Even though Rāmacandra is gifted with the creative faculty, which is evident in the suitable artistic modifications which he has made in the original story of Nala, Rāma and others, still however, the natural faculty appears to be considerably suppressed by the zest of exhibiting technical details and pedantry.

His dramas appear as a product of a conscious mind well-versed in the technicalities of drama rather than of an inspired artist. In the words of Shri R. V. Pathak, "The plays of Rāmacandra lack in a concrete picture of human nature or a great vision of truth which make a poet immortal".[5]

---

1. शम्भुस्वयम्भुहरयो हरिणेक्षणानाम्
   येनाक्रियन्त सततं गृहकुम्भदासाः ।
   ....
   तस्मै नमो भगवते कुसुमायुधाय ॥ मल्लिकामकरन्द १, १३.
   The verse is borrowed from भर्तृहरि's शृङ्गारशतक.
2. अहो, सर्वातिशायी द्विजन्मनां निसर्गसिद्धो लोभातिरेको यदयमन्त्येऽपि वयसि वृथा वृद्धो निधनधनप्रतिग्रहान्न विरमति । — नलविलास, पृ० ८०
3. Vide Kaumudīmitrānanda I, 17
4. परोपनीतशब्दार्थाः स्वनाम्ना कृतकीर्तयः ।
   निबद्धारोऽधुना तेन विश्रम्भस्तेषु कः सताम् ॥ कौमुदीमित्राणन्द, १ मल्लिकामकरन्द १, ७
   For a detailed list of such common verses vide the Nalavilāsa (G.O.S.) (Intro.) p. 34
5. R. V. Pathak : Nalavilāsanāṭaka.

Rāmacandra is a critic as well as a dramatist. The creative faculty is different from the critical one.[1] It is a rare case where these two faculties combine. Still however, Rāmacandra is a critic first and an artist afterwards. He seems to have written his plays having fully borne in mind all the principles of dramaturgy. Even as a creative artist he is more of a poet and less of a dramatist.

Finally even though we cannot describe Rāmacandra as a poet of the first rank still he deserves a respectable position amongst the later Sanskrit dramatists and Gujarat can legitimately be proud that even in the thirteenth century such plays were written and probably staged also.

1. Rājaśekhara divides Pratibhā into two types :-
(i) Creative (Kārayitrī)
(ii) Critical (Bhāvayitrī)

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATION OF THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA TO OTHER WORKS ON DRAMATURGY OR POETICS

A. *The ND's indebtedness to the earlier works on dramaturgy*

As we have occasionally seen in the earlier chapters (Ch. III to VI) the authors of the ND have considerably borrowed from their predecessors especially Bharata, Abhinavagupta, Dhanañjaya and others. This chapter therefore presents a comparative study of the Nāṭyadarpaṇa and other works on dramaturgy. We start with the relation of the ND to the NS.

(i) *The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Nāṭyaśāstra*

The NS is reputed to be the oldest extant work on dramaturgy. Bharata who is rightly called "the father of literary criticism"[1] deserves the credit of bringing to light the principles of dramaturgy in a systematic form which lay scattered before his times. The NS therefore is accepted as a "canonical book of Indian dramaturgy."

The later writers on dramaturgy acknowledge their indebtedness to this 'intellectual giant' and express their feeling of reverence and gratitude to him. The DR goes to the extent of saying, "Who else is capable of defining Nāṭya?"[2] and humbly expresses that whatever is embodied by him in his work is merely a summary of what the learned preceptors had already proclaimed.

Our authors too admit their indebtedness to their previous writers in their introductory verses[3]. The NS being the most authentic work on dramaturgy the ND has accepted most of the definitions from the NS only. That our authors have mainly followed the old authorities (i. e. Bharata) is evident from the following instances:-

1. At the end of the discussion of Uparūpakas the ND states that these Rūpakas have been mentioned in the commentary only, (and not in Kārikās,) because they are less interesting and have not been mentioned by the old authorities[4].

2. The ND condemns those who propound that the hero of a Nāṭaka should be Dhīrodātta only, on the basis of the fact that they do not abide by the tradition established by Bharata[5].

---

1. Cf. Encyclopaedia Britanica Vol. II, p. 397.
2. DR I, 4.
3. ND, p. 23, verse No. 2.
4. Cf. ND, p. 215.
5. Cf. ND, p. 29.

3. While discussing Prakaraṇa the ND points out that those who assert that the hero of a Prakaraṇa should be of Dhīraśānta type, having a minister in their view are not supported by the Vṛddhas (i. e Bharata) (and therefore cannot be accepted). Here the ND quotes one line from the NS in support of this statement[1].

4. The ND criticises Bhavabhūti for employing Kaiśikī in exuberance in his Prakaraṇa called Mālatīmādhava which, the ND observes, is against the opinion of the Vṛddhas[2].

5. While discussing Dhruvās the ND remarks that "Prāsādikī Dhruvā must be introduced after Prāveśikī and Ākṣepikī as 'the old tradition' says so"[3].

The above-quoted instances are sufficient to show that the ND takes the old authorities, viz., Bharata and others as binding upon all and criticises those who disregard these authorities[4].

Moreover, our authors literally quote the NS of Bharata more than once :-

1. They bodily quote in series the Nāndī verses given by Bharata by mentioning his name[5].

2. At the end of the discussion of the sixty four Sandhyaṅgas the ND mentions that other twenty one Sandhyantaras also are mentioned by some and they quote three verses from the NS enumerating these[6].

3. The ND also quotes the celebrated dictum of Bharata on Rasa, namely, Rasa is produced by the communion of Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas.[7] (Of course the name of Bharata is not mentioned along with the dictum).

4. The ND quotes as an authority from the NS the statement-"The

1. ND, p. 117.
2. ND, p. 120.
3. ND, p. 193
4. It may be pointed out here that even though the authors of the ND criticize those who disregard the early authorities, they themselves have not always followed those authorities, as will be seen from the later discussion. At one place they have even accused Bharata of self-contradiction.
5. Vide ND, p. 192, Tathā ca bharatamuniḥ nāndīṁ paṭhati..... etc. (NS V, 110-113). This is a rare phenomenon in this work. The authors of the ND hardly refer by name to any author (excepting of course when they want to criticise him). This reveals the high esteem in which the authors of the ND hold this old sage as it suggests that they do not feel humiliated in quoting from Bharata as an authority and accepting the debt by mentioning his name.
6. ND, p. 116; NS (KM) XIX, 105-107.
7. Vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṁyogād rasaniṣpattiḥ-ND, p. 161; NS (KM), p. 62.

commander-in-chief and the minister are of Dhīrodātta type".[1] (without any specific reference to Bharata).

5. The ND verbally quotes the ten Lāsyāṅgas from the NS[2].

The ND refers to Bharata in various ways. Sometimes the ND calls him Muni[3] or Pūrvamuni[4], sometimes he is referred to as Vṛddha[5] and at times as Pūrvācārya[6] or Nāṭyacārya[7]. The view of Bharata is also referred to as Munisamaya[8], Vṛddhasampradāya[9] or Vṛddbābhiprāya[10].

A comparative study of the two texts (the ND and the NS) will clearly show that the ND has mostly depended upon Bharata while defining and explaining the various topics concerned. The NS was in fact the chief source-book for all the later writers on dramaturgy. So ND's indebtedness to the NS is obvious and evident. A full list of all the instances where the ND has directly or indirectly borrowed significant phrases or ideas is practically impossible as it would be too lengthy, which is neither necessary nor desirable. I therefore have to content myself by giving a specimen or two of each type of borrowing.

Sometimes the ND borrows verbatim from the NS.[11] Very often the ND picks up significant phrases from the NS and puts the idea in its own language[12]. Authors of the ND fully know their limitation of space.

---

1. ND, p. 178; NS (KM) XXIV, 4
2. ND, p. 127, NS (KM) XVIII, 183-4.
3. ND, p. 120.
4. ND, p. 26
5. ND, p. 215.
6. ND, pp. 155, 163. The plural used in some cases is likely to be for showing reverence.
7. ND, p. 195.
8. ND, p. 29.
9. ND, pp. 35, 194, 117.
10. ND, p. 120.
11. e.g (a) Verses enumerating Rasas and Sthāyī Bhāvas verbally echo NS. Cf. ND III, 111 and NS (GOS) VI, 15 and ND III, 126 and NS (GOS) VI, 17.
    (b) Enumeration of Angas and Upāṅgas in Āṅgika Abhinaya. Cf.
    ND :- अङ्गैः शिरोहस्तवक्षःकटीपार्श्वपादादिभिरुपाङ्गैश्च
    नेत्रभ्रूपक्ष्माधरकपोलचिबुकादिभिः ...... (पृष्ठ-१८९)
    NS :- तस्य शिरोहस्तोरःपार्श्वकटीपादतः षडङ्गानि ।
    नेत्रभ्रूनासाधरकपोलचिबुकान्युपाङ्गानि ॥ (KM) ८, १३
12. (a) Definition of Mukha -
    ND :- मुखं प्रधानवृत्तांशो बीजोत्पत्तिरसाश्रयः । ...... पृ. ५४.
    NS :- यत्र बीजसमुत्पत्तिः नानार्थरससंभवा काव्ये ... तन्मुखं
    परिकीर्तितम् ॥ ...... (KM) पृष्ठ - ३१२.

They could not afford to be lengthy unnecessarily. A work like the ND which proposes to discuss in a few pages almost all problems which a writer of drama has to face cannot afford to be very elaborate. So the ND sometimes summarizes in a few words what Bharata has elaborately discussed in good many verses. For instance, the ND summarizes in a few lines the Āṅgika Abhinaya described by Bharata in several chapters (NS (KM) Ch. VIII to XII)[1]. On the other hand, at times the ND simplifies or elaborates what Bharata has stated briefly. For better elucidation the ND resorts to concrete illustrations, e.g., the topic on Sandhis and Sandhyaṅgas has been treated of rather briefly by the NS, while the ND devotes considerable space to the topic making the treatment exhaustive with profuse illustrations from a large number of plays. Even the treatment of the twelve types of Rūpakas, the limbs of Vīthī, etc. as we find in the ND is rather more elaborate as compared to the treatment of the NS.[2]

It is true that the authors of the ND have followed Bharata in most cases, still however they do not always follow the NS. At places they differ.

(a) While the NS recognises only ten types of Rūpakas, the ND recognises twelve types of Rūpakas. The ND here gives the Nāṭikā and the Prakaraṇikā the status of principal Rūpakas.

(b) The NS mentions eight Rasas[3]. The ND adds Śānta and makes the number nine and adds that there can be even more Rasas than nine such as Laulya, Sneha, Duḥkha, Sukha, etc.[4]

(b) Definition of Pratimukha –

ND :– प्रतिमुखं किंयल्लक्ष्यबीजोद्घाटसमन्वितः । ... पृ. ५५.

NS :– बीजस्योद्घाटनं यत्तु दृष्टनष्टमिव क्वचित् ।
मुखन्यस्तस्य सर्वत्र तद्वै प्रतिमुखं स्मृतम् ॥ (K.M) १९, ४०

1. Cf. .–

(a) ND .– तत्रोत्तमाङ्गस्याकम्पितकम्पितादयस्त्रयोदश । ...... पृष्ठ – १८९

NS :– शिरसा प्रथमं कर्म गदता मे निबोधत ।
आकम्पितं कम्पितं च ...... त्रयोदशविधं शिरः ॥ ... (KM) ८, १६–१८.

(b) ND :– दृष्टेः कान्ताभयानकादयः षट्त्रिंशत् ।

NS :– अतः परं प्रवक्ष्यामि दृष्टीनामिह लक्षणम् ।
कान्ताभयानकाहास्या ... ...
षट्त्रिंशद्दृष्टयो ह्येता नामतोऽभिहिता मया ॥ : (K.M) ८, ३७–४२.

2. In fact the nature and scope of Bharata's NS is so vast that it cannot afford to elaborate and illustrate the various topics.
3. NS (KM) VI, 16.
4. ND, p. 163.

(c) The NS considers all Rasas pleasant and enjoyable[1] while the ND opines that some of the Rasas are pleasant while others like Karuṇa, Raudra, Bībhatsa and Bhayānaka, are not pleasant[2].

(d) The ND does not treat of Citrābhinaya discussed by Bharata[3]. The ND includes it in Āṅgika Abhinaya as the former consists of the movement of limbs of body and is simply a mixture of two, three or four of the Abhinayas.

(e) Bharata has described in detail the religious preliminaries called Pūrvaraṅga which ought to be performed before the actual staging of a dramatic piece. The ND opines that these are all (except Nāndī) futile and meant to deceive the faithful votaries[4]. (This is, in fact, a hit to the Brahmanical ritualism by a Jaina writer.)

(f) The ND defines as many as thirteen minor plays (which the ND calls other Rūpakas) which are not mentioned by Bharata.

(g) The NS gives five types of Prastāvanā viz. Kathodghāta and others. The ND does not approve of any of these types. What Bharata calls 'types', the ND calls "the modes of introducing a character on the stage".

Moreover, the NS includes only two of the Vīthyaṅgas (viz. Udghātyaka and Avalagita) as the types of Prastāvanā, while the ND thinks that not only two but all of the thirteen Vīthyaṅgas can be introduced in a prologue.

(h) Bharata divides each of the four Vṛttis into four types, e. g., Bhāratī has four limbs - Prarocanā, Āmukha, Vīthī and Prahasana. Similarly Sātvatī, Kaiśikī and Ārabhaṭī also have four limbs each. The ND does not admit of any such types or limbs of Vṛttis even though in case of Bhāratī the ND points out that it occurs in Āmukha, Prarocanā and all the Rūpakas.

(i) Bharata wants that Vedic metres, viz., Uṣṇik and Gāyatrī should be used profusely in Samavakāra[5]. The ND on the contrary holds that Gāyatrī and other Vedic metres should not be used in Samavakāra[6]. (It may be noted here that the editors of the NS give another reading in the foot-note according to which these Vṛttas should not be used in

1. Cf. Āsvādayanti manasā tasmān nāṭyarasāḥ smṛtāḥ - NS (KM), p. 193.
2. ND, p. 159.
3. NS (KM) XXV, cf. ND, p. 191.
4. Śraddhālupratāraṇamātratvāt - ND, p. 155, also cf. keṣāṁcit niṣphalatvāt...ND, p. 193.
5. NS (KM) XVIII, 128.
6. Na punar gāyatryādi - ND, p. 126.

Samavakāra[1] and it is possible that the edition of the NS which our authors possessed might have this second reading which the ND follows.)

(j) The NS gives in some MSs twenty one other Sandhyantaras (Sandhyantaraṁ aṅgakalpaṁ)[2] beginning with Sāma[3] nnd ordains that these Sandhyantaras along with the sixty four Sandhyaṅgas, Lakṣaṇas, Guṇas, etc. should be employed in a Nāṭaka[4]. The ND quotes these 21 Sandhyantaras verbatim from the NS under the opinion of 'some' ('kecit) and opines that some of these can be included in Angas, some in Vyabhicāribhāvas, and some are parts of the actual plot (Itivṛtta)[5],

(k) Bharata holds that the Vidūṣaka of a king should be a Brahmin only while the ND allows any of the three types: an ascetic, a Brahmin or a king's employee.

(l) Bharata refers to Stambha, Sveda, etc. as Sāttvika Bhāvas while the ND calls them Anubhāvas.

Not only do the authors of the ND differ from Bharata on several points but they go to the extent of even criticizing Bharata for a self-contradiction he has committed in restricting Bhāratī Vṛtti to Karuṇa and Bībhatsa Rasas only and at the same time ordaining Bhāratī for Vīthī, Prahasana[6] and Bhāṇa none of which is characterized by Karuṇa or Bībhatsa as its dominant sentiment.[7]

At times we find the ND referring to the view of the NS as 'Kecit' or 'Anye' or 'Apare', e. g.

(a) ND - Anye tu saṁhatānāṁ pratipakṣāṇāṁ bījaphalotpattinirodhakānām viśleṣakam bhedarūpam upāyam bhedanaṁ manvate -(p. 65). Also cf. NS - Saṁghātabhedanārtho yaḥ sa bheda iti saṁjñitaḥ - (KM) XIX, 73.

(b) The ND - Apare tu krodhādeḥ prāptasya śamanaṁ dyutiṁ āmananti (p. 108). Cf. NS - Labdhasyārthasya śamanaṁ dyutiḥ etc. (KM) XIX, 97.

---

1. NS (KM), p 29, F. N 2 NS (GOS) Vol. II, p. 441, F. N.
2. NS, (KM) XIX, 48 F. N.
3. Ibid. XXI, 49-51.
4. Ibid. XXI, 118-120.
5. ND, p. 116
6. Vīthī and Prahasana are considered to be the limbs of Bhāratī Vṛtti by the NS (KM) XX, 26.
7. Vide-Ye tu bhāratyāṁ bībhatsa-karuṇau prapannāḥ taiḥ sarvarasavīthī-pradhānaśṛṅgāravīrabhāṇa-pradhānahāsyaprahasanāni svayam eva bhāratyāṁ vṛttau niyantritāni nāvekṣitāni (ND, p. 153). Here it may be noted that whenever the ND criticizes higher authorities the language used is very polite and considerate.

(c) The ND refers to the view of 'some' who do not accept 'Upāsti' but recognize 'Prasāda' instead, which is defined as 'gratification arising out of some service rendered by the person'[1]. This view can be ascribed to Bharata who reads Prasāda instead of Upāsti and defines it in a similar way.[2]

(d) The ND refers to the view of some (kecit) who read Pūrvavākya instead of Pūrvabhāva. It is not possible to say categorically that here the ND refers to the NS because even though the NS reads Pūrvavākya there is another reading which reads Pūrvabhāva also[3].

The gist of the above discussion is that even though the authors of the ND have accepted Bharata as the final authority on dramaturgy and have followed him in most cases they have not always done so. They sometimes differ from him and at times even critisize him.

(ii) *The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Abhinavabhāratī*

Amongst the writers on dramaturgy, Abhinava shines as one of the brightest stars. His position among the prominent writers on Alaṁkāraśāstra can hardly be challenged. His learned commentaries upon the Nāṭyaśāstra and the Dhvanyāloka speak volumes for his learning, eruditions and critical insight into the subject of poetics including dramaturgy. His deep scholarship baffles even great scholars. It is not surprising if such a master critic leaves an indelible impression on the mind of our authors and they naturally try to make the best use of the commentaries of this great 'intellectual giant'.

The debt that Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra owe to this great personality cannot be over-estimated. Just as in composing the Kārikās the authors have drawn abundantly upon the NS of Bharata, in the same way in writing the Vṛtti or the commentary the authors have mainly followed Abhinava. At great many places we find them to have copied Abhinava. Whatever is striking or attractive in the ND has, in many a case, its origin in the Abhinavabhāratī.

At times the authors of the ND have lifted lines after lines, sentences after sentences, sometimes even a paragraph. Some times they have picked up the significant word, words or phrases from Abhinava and the matter is put in their own language. At many a place the ideas have been lifted and dressed in their own language. Wherever Abhinava is obscure, the ND has tried to present him in a simpler and clearer manner. In case Abhinava is too brief our authors have expanded the idea so as

1. ND, p. 117.
2. NS (GOS) XIX, 101.
3. Vide ND, p. 113 and NS (GOS) XIX, 103.

to make it clear and easily comprehensible. The authors of the ND skip over such passages as contain lengthy and pedantic discussions carried on by Abhinava and are not very essential to the exposition of the topics concerned. Thus they summarize what the former has elaborately treated of and put the same in a well connected systematic form.

The indebtedness of the authors of the ND to Abhinava may conveniently be considered under the following headings :-

I. *Borrowing verbatim* :-

(a) of passages.

(b) of sentances.

(c) of illustrations.

II. *Verbal borrowing with minor changes*

Here the important phrases are retained along with the idea. Some words are replaced by exact synonyms. This can be divided into two subheadings :-

(a) borrowing of passages.

(b) borrowing of sentences.

III. *Borrowing of ideas.* Here only the matter is borrowed while the language and representation are the authors' own.

(I) *Borrowing Verbatim*

(a) *Of Passages* :- It is rarely that the ND copies passages after passages verbatim. In that case the ND would very legitimately be accused of gross plagiarism - an unpardonable fault. Still however, the following can be quoted as an illustration of the type :-

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
यथा रत्नावल्याम्–सागरिकायां पाशावलम्बनप्रवृत्तायां वासवदत्तेति मन्यमानो राजा पाशाद् विमोचयति तदा तदुक्त्या सागरिकां प्रत्यभिज्ञायाह – "कथं मे प्रिया सागरिका? अलमलमतिमात्रेण।" इत्यादि। अत्रान्यत् प्रयोजनं चिन्तितम्, वैचित्र्यकारि च प्रयोजनान्तरं सम्पन्नम्। — पृ० ४४	यथा रत्नावल्यां सागरिकायां पाशावलम्बनप्रवृत्तायां वासवदत्तेयमिति मन्यमानो राजा पाशं मुञ्चति तदा तदुक्त्या सागरिकां प्रत्यभिज्ञाय 'हा कथं प्रिया मे सागरिका, अलमलमतिमात्र" मित्यादि। अत्रान्यत् प्रयोजनं चिन्तितं तद्वैचित्र्यकारि च प्रयोजनान्तरं सम्पन्नम्। — ग्रन्थ २, पृ० १९

(b) *Of Sentences*

१. ... मृदा परपक्षमर्दनेन स्वपक्षमवति रक्षतीति मृदवम्। — पृ० १४७	१. मृदवमिति मर्दनं मृत्परपक्षमर्दनेन स्वपक्षमवति रक्षतीति। ग्रं० २, पृ० ४५७

नाट्यदर्पण

२. ... तदवस्पन्दितं चक्षुःस्पन्दनादिवदन्तर्गत – सूचनीयसम्भवात्। यथा वेणीसंहारे – सत्पक्षा मधुरगिरः प्रसाधिताशा ... इत्यादि।

— पृ० १५०

३. यदाह कोहलः—
'उत्तमाधममध्याभिर्युक्ता प्रकृतिभिस्त्रिधा।
एकहार्या द्विहार्या वा सा वीथीत्यभिसंज्ञिता॥"
इति।

— पृ० १३२

४. तत्र कञ्चुकिस्थाने दासः। अमात्यस्थाने श्रेष्ठी। विदूषकस्थाने विटः।

— पृ० ११८

५ यस्तु वेणीसंहारे भानुमत्या सह दुर्योधनस्य दर्शितो रत्यभिलाषरूपो विलासः। स नायकस्य तादृशेऽवसरेऽनुचितः।
यदाह—
"सन्धिसन्ध्यङ्गघटनं रसबन्धव्यपेक्षया।
न तु केवलशास्त्रार्थस्थितिसम्पादनेच्छया॥"
इति।

— पृ० ७०

६ ... दैवबहुमानव्युत्पत्तये पुरुषकारोऽप्यफलस्तदभावोऽपि सफल इति दर्शनीयम्।

— पृ० ५३

७. अन्यस्मिन्नुपाये चिन्तिते सहसोपायान्तरप्राप्तिर्यथा नागानन्दे जीमूतवाहनस्य शंखचूडादप्राप्तवध्यपटस्य कञ्चुकिना वासोयुगलार्पणमिति।

— पृ० ४५

अभिनवभारती

२. तदवस्पन्दितं चक्षुःस्पन्दनादिवदन्तर्गतसूचनीयसम्भवात्। यथा सत्पक्षा मधुरगिरः प्रसाधिताशा ... इत्यादि।

ग्रं० २, पृ० ४५५

३. तथा च कोहलः —
उत्तमाधममध्याभिर्युक्ता प्रकृतिभिस्त्रिधा।
एकहार्या द्विहार्या वा सा वीथीत्यभिसंज्ञिता॥

— ग्रं० २, पृ० ४५१

४. ... कञ्चुकिस्थाने दासः, विदूषकस्थाने विटः, अमात्यस्थाने श्रेष्ठीत्यर्थ.।

— ग्रं० २, पृ० ४३१

५. यस्तु वेणीसंहारे भानुमत्या सह दुर्योधनस्य दर्शितो विलासः, स नायकस्य तादृशेऽवसरेऽत्यनुचित इति चिरन्तनैरेवोक्तम्।
यथा सहृदयालोककारः –
सन्धिसन्ध्यङ्गघटनं रसबन्धव्यपेक्षया।
न तु केवलशास्त्रार्थस्थितिसम्पादनेच्छया॥

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ४२

६. ... दैवबहुमानव्युत्पत्तये हि पुरुषकारोऽप्यफलः, तदभावोऽपि सफलः प्रदर्शनीयः ...।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ४८

७. अन्यस्मिन्नुपाये चिन्तिते सहसोपायान्तरप्राप्तिः यथा नागानन्दे जीमूतवाहनस्य शंखचूडादप्राप्तवध्यपटस्य कंचुकिना वासोयुगलार्पणम्।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० २०

(C) *Of Illustrations*

		Nāṭyadarpaṇa		*Abhinavabhāratī*		
1.	Udghātyaka	p.	149.	II	p.	454.
2.	Avaspandita	p.	150.	II	p.	455.
3.	Nālikā	p.	146.	II	p.	455.
4.	Vyāhāra	p.	135.	II	p.	458.
5.	Prapañca	p.	140.	II	p.	456.
6.	Trigata	p.	143.	II	p.	458.
7.	Chala	p.	143.	II	p.	457.

	Nāṭyadarpaṇa			Abhinavabhāratī		
8.	Asatpralāpa	p.	144.	II	p.	456.
9.	Vākkelī	p.	145.	II	p.	456.
10.	Śṛṅgāra	p.	124.	I	p.	303.
11.	Aṅka	p.	34.	II	p.	416.
12.	Prakaraṇa	p.	118.	II	p.	433.
13.	Parikara	p.	60.	III	p.	38.
14.	Parinyāsa	p.	61.	III	p.	38.
15.	Samāhiti	p.	62.	III	p.	40.
16.	Udbheda	p.	62.	III	p.	41.
17.	Karana	p.	63.	III	p.	41.
18.	Vilobhana	p.	64.	III	p.	38.
19.	Bhedana	p.	64.	III	p.	42.
20.	Prāpaṇa	p.	65.	III	p.	39.
21.	Vilāsa	p.	69.	III	p.	42.
22.	Varṇasaṁhṛti	p.	73.	III	p.	47.
23.	Narma	p.	74.	III	p.	44.
24.	Narmadyuti	pp.	75-76.	III	p.	44.
25.	Udāhṛti	p.	85.	III	p.	48.
26.	Krama	p.	86.	III	p.	49.
27.	Ākṣepa	p.	89.	III	p.	50.
28.	Adhibala	p.	89.	III	p.	51.
29.	Chādana	p.	95.	III	p.	56.
30.	Śakti	p.	100.	III	p.	53.
31.	Vyavasāya	p.	103.	III	p.	54.
32.	Sandhi	p.	104.	III	p.	57.
33.	Kṛti	p.	108.	III	p.	58.
34.	Pūrvabhāva	p.	114.	III	p.	58.
35.	Avasthā	p.	53.	III	p.	8.
36.	Patākāsthānaka	p.	45.	III	p.	20.
37.	Patākāsthānaka	p.	45-6.	III	p.	21.
38.	Patākāsthānaka	p.	45.	III	p.	21.
39.	Rasas: Their interrelation	p.	186.	I	p.	297.

II. *Verbal borrowing with minor changes* :–

(a) *Of passages*

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
१ फलस्य मुख्यसाधनस्य हेतव उपायाः । इह हेतुर्द्विधा अचेतनश्चेतनश्च । अचेतनोऽपि मुख्यामुख्यभेदाद् द्विधा । मुख्यो बीजम्...। अमुख्यस्तु कार्यम् । चेतनोऽपि द्विधा मुख्य -उपकरणभूतश्च । मुख्यो बिन्दुः ... । उपकरणभूतश्च द्विधा स्वार्थसिद्धियुतः परार्थसिद्धिपर. । ... पूर्वः पताका अन्यः प्रकरीति । — पृ० ४१–७२	१ यत्रार्थः फलं तस्य प्रकृतयः ... । तत्र जडचेतनया द्विधाकरणम्, जडश्च मुख्यकारणभूतः ... आद्य बीजं द्वितीयं कार्यम् ... । चेतनोऽपि द्विधा मुख्य उपकरणभूतश्च, अन्त्योऽपि द्विधा स्वार्थसिद्धिसहितया परार्थसिद्धया युक्तः शुद्धया च, तत्राद्यो बिन्दुः द्वितीयः पताका तृतीयः प्रकरी । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० १२
२ तेनैकमप्यङ्ग रसपोषकत्वादेकस्मिन्नपि सन्धौ द्विस्त्रिर्वा निबध्यते । यथा वेणीसंहारे सम्फेटविद्रवौ पुनः पुनर्दर्शितौ वीररौद्ररसावुद्दीपयतः । रत्नावल्यां च विलासः पुनः पुनरुक्तः शृङ्गारमुल्लासयति । अतः परमपि वैरस्यमावहतीति । तथाऽङ्गद्वयेन साध्यं यदेकेनैव सिध्यति तदेकमेव निबध्यते । यथा श्रीभीमदेवसूनोर्वसुनागस्य कृतौ प्रतिमानिरुद्धे परिकरार्थस्योपक्षेपेणैव गतत्वान्न निबन्धः । एवमङ्गत्रयेणापि । यथा मेज्जलविरचिते राधाविप्रलम्भे रासकाङ्के परिकरपरिन्यासयोरुपक्षेपेणैव गतत्वान्न तन्निबन्धः । एवम् ... चतुरङ्गोऽपि सन्धिर्भवति । — पृ० ११५–६	२ तेनैकमपि सन्ध्यङ्गं तत्रैव सन्धौ द्विस्त्रिर्वा कर्तव्यम् । यथा रत्नावल्यां ... विलासः असकृदुपनिबद्धः प्रधान शृङ्गारमुद्दीपयति । वेणीसंहारे सम्फेटविद्रवौ पुनः प्रदर्शितौ वीररौद्रोद्दीपकौ भवतः । अतिशयेन तु पौनःपुन्ये वैरस्यं स्यात् ... । तथा द्वयोर्योगो द्वाभ्यामङ्गाभ्यां सम्पाद्य तदेकेनैव चेद् घटते तत्किमपरेण । एवं त्रियोगः । द्वियोगो यथा प्रतिमानिरुद्धे भीमसूनोर्वसुनागस्य कृते–उपक्षेपानन्तरमेव न परिकरः ... । एवं त्रियोगः, यथा मेज्जलविरचिते राधाविप्रलम्भे रासकाङ्के उपक्षेपेणैव हि ... । एवं चतुरङ्गो ... सन्धिर्भवतीति । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ६२–६३.
३. एषु च केषाञ्चित् सामादीनां स्वयमङ्गरूपत्वात् केषाञ्चित् ... व्यभिचारिरूपत्वाद् ... न पृथग्लक्षणे प्रयासः । ... तथोदात्तराघवे हेत्ववधारणात्मा उपक्षेपः । प्रतिमानिरुद्धे स्वप्नरूपः । रामाभ्युदये भयात्मा । वेणीसंहारे क्रोधात्मा । — पृ० ११६	३. अन्ये मन्यन्ते — य एवोपक्षेपादयः सामान्या उक्ताः तेषामेवैतद्विशेषा अवान्तरभेदाः । उपक्षेपो हि सामादिविशेषभिन्नः, तथा हि 'लाक्षागृहानल'— (वेणी १) इति क्रोधात्मोपक्षेपः, रामाभ्युदये भयात्मोपक्षेपः, प्रतिमानिरुद्धे स्वप्नरूपः, उदात्तराघवे हेत्ववधारणात्मा। — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ६३–६४.
४. एवञ्च पुष्पदूषितकेऽशोकदत्तादिशब्दाकर्णनेन समुद्रदत्तस्य नन्दयन्त्यां या व्यलीकशङ्कोपनिबद्धा सा न दोषाय परपुरुषसम्भावनाया निर्वहणं यावदत्रोपयोगित्वात् । अपरथोत्तम-	४. ...... पुष्पदूषितकेऽशोकदत्तादिशब्दाकर्णनेन समुद्रदत्तस्य शङ्का योपनिबद्धा सा न दोषाय । निर्वहणान्तोपयोगिनी हि नन्दयन्तीनिर्वासनं तस्याश्च गृहान्तरावस्था । इदमेव मुखसन्धौ

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
प्रकृतिना श्वशुरेण वध्वाः पुत्रे दूरस्थिते निर्वासनम्, निर्वासितायाश्च शबरसेनापतिगृहेऽवस्थानमनुचितमेव । — पृ० ११७	मूलं परपुरुषसम्भावनामूलत्वात् । एवमभ्युपगमे तु श्वशुरेण वध्वा असन्निहिते पुत्रे निर्वासनं शबरसेनापतिगृहेऽवस्थानमित्युत्तमप्रकृतीनामनुपपन्नमेव । — ग्रं० २, पृ० ४३२
५ … अङ्गदेनाभिद्रूयमाणाया मन्दोदर्या भयम्, अङ्गदस्योत्साहोऽस्यैव रावणदर्शनेन "एतेनापि सुरा जिता" इत्यादि वदतो हासः, 'यस्तातेन निगृह्य बालक इव प्रक्षिप्य कक्षान्तरे' इति च जल्पतो जुगुप्सा-हास-विस्मयाः, रावणस्य रति-क्रोधौ । — पृ० १५८	५. … अङ्गदेनाभिद्रूयमाणाया मन्दोदर्या भयम्, अङ्गदस्योत्साहः रावणं दृष्ट्वा तस्यैव हि "एतेनापि सुरा जिता" इत्यादि वदतो हासः, रावणस्यातिक्रोधः, "यस्तातेन निगृह्य बालक इव प्रक्षिप्य कक्षान्तरे" इति वदतोऽङ्गदस्य जुगुप्सा–हास–विस्मय–रसाः । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० १०४
६. तत्र कामस्य सर्वजातिसुलभतयाऽत्यन्तपरिचिततया च सर्वान्प्रति हृद्यतेति पूर्वं शृङ्गारः ततः शृङ्गारानुगामित्वात् हास्यः ततो हास्यविरोधित्वात्करुणः कामस्य चार्थजत्वाद् … शम इति । — पृ० १६३	६. तत्र कामस्य सर्वजातिसुलभतयाऽत्यन्तपरिचितत्वेन सर्वान्प्रति हृद्यतेति पूर्वं शृङ्गारः तदनुगामी च हास्यः निरपेक्षभावत्वात् । तद्विपरीतः करुणः । …… शान्तः । — ग्रं० १, पृ० २६७

(b) *Of sentences* : (Below are quoted the sentences where the ND has almost verbally lifted from the Abhi. with very insignificant changes.)

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
१. इह ख्यातत्वं त्रिधा नाम्ना चेष्टितेन देशेन च । — पृ० २०	१. … त्रिविधया प्रसिद्धया प्रसिद्धत्वं भवति, अमुक एवकारी अमुत्रदेश इति । — ग्रं० २, पृ० ४११
२. नायिका तु दिव्यापि भवति यथोर्वशी । — पृ० २०	२ नायिका तु दिव्याप्यविरोधिनी यथोर्वशी । — ग्रं० २, पृ० ४१२
३. दिव्याङ्गमिति … सहायः पताकाप्रकरीनायकलक्षणो यत्र । — पृ० २८	३. दिव्यानामाश्रयत्वेन प्रकरीपताकानायकादिरूपेण … अङ्गीकरणं यत्र । — ग्रं० २, पृ० ४१२
४. तापसवत्सराजे हि वत्सराजस्य मुख्याय कौशाम्बीराज्यलाभाय प्रवृत्तेन … वासवदत्तासंगमपद्मावतीप्राप्त्यादिकमपि साध्यते । — पृ० ३०	४. तापसवत्सराजे राज्यप्रत्यापत्तेः प्रधानफलत्वे वासवदत्तासंगमपद्मावतीप्राप्त्यादौ क्रियान्तरानुपयोग एव मन्तव्यः । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ३

	नाट्यदर्पण		अभिनवभारती
५.	यथा रत्नावल्यां प्रमोदोत्सवो मुखसन्धावेव निक्षिप्तः मुखोपक्षिप्तो बाभ्रव्यादिवृत्तान्तश्च निर्वहणारम्भे, रत्नावलीप्राप्त्यादयश्च सार-रूपाः पदार्थाः अन्त इति । — पृ० ३३	५.	तद्यथा रत्नावल्यां प्रमोदोत्सवो मुखसन्धावेव निक्षिप्तः इत्यादि यावत् बाभ्रव्यवृत्तान्तो मुखोपक्षिप्तो निर्वहणनिष्ठां प्राप्तः । साररूपाश्च पदार्थाः पर्यन्ते कर्तव्याः । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४२९
६.	विष्कम्भात्यनुसन्धानेन वृत्तमुपष्टम्भयतीति विष्कम्भकः । — पृ० ३८	६.	विष्कम्भयत्युपस्तम्भयतीति विष्कम्भकः । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४३३
७.	अप्रत्यक्षान् अर्थान् सामाजिकहृदये प्रवेशयतीति प्रवेशकः । — पृ० ३९	७	अदृष्टमप्यर्थं हृदि प्रवेशयन्ति इति प्रवेशकाः । — प्र० २, पृ० ४२१
८	अल्पकाले चाङ्कास्यम्, अल्पतरकाले च चूलिका ... अल्पतमकाले चाङ्कावतार इति । — पृ० ४१	८.	परिमितं तु यदनुसन्धेयम् तत्राङ्कमुखमल्पानुसंधेये चूलिका, अल्पतमे अङ्कावतारः । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४२२
९	सुग्रीवविभीषणादिर्हि रामादिनोपक्रियमाणो रामादेरात्मनश्चोपकाराय भवन् रामादेः प्रसिद्धिं प्राशस्त्यं च सम्पादयति । — पृ० ४३-४४	९.	सुग्रीवविभीषणप्रभृतिरपि रामादिनोपक्रियमाणे रामादेरात्मनश्चोपकाराय प्रभवमाने प्रसिद्धिप्राशस्त्ये सम्पादयतीति । — प्रं० ३, पृ० १५
१०.	सर्वव्यापित्वाद्वा जले तैलबिन्दुरिव बिन्दुः । — पृ० ४६	१०.	तैलबिन्दुवत् सर्वव्यापित्वादपि बिन्दुः । — प्र० ३, पृ० १४
११.	केवलं बीजं मुखसन्धेरेव प्रभृति निबध्यते बिन्दुस्तु तदनन्तरमिति । — पृ० ४६	११.	बीजं च मुखसन्धेरेव प्रवर्त्यमानमुन्मेषयति बिन्दुस्तदनन्तरमिति विशेषोऽनयोः । — प्र० ३, पृ० १४
१२.	बीजवत् समस्तेतिवृत्तव्यापकत्वमाह । — पृ० ४६	१२.	द्वे अपि तु समस्तेतिवृत्तव्यापके । — प्रं० ३ पृ० १४
१३.	नेतुर्मुख्यफलं प्रति बीजाद्युपायान्प्रयोक्तुरवस्थाः ... कायवाङ्मनसो व्यापाराः । — पृ० ४९	१३.	साध्ये व्यापारपरिस्पन्दो यो वा मनसभूतस्तस्य या अवस्थाः ... । — प्रं० ३, पृ० ६
१४.	प्रारम्भावस्थाभावित्वात् ... . मुखमिव मुखम् ...... । — पृ० ५४	१४.	प्रागारम्भभावित्वान्मुखमिव मुखम् ।
१५.	प्रारम्भोपयोगी यावानर्थराशिः प्रसक्तानुप्रसक्त्या विचित्ररससन्निवेशस्तावान्मुखसन्धिः । — पृ० ५४	१५.	प्रारम्भोपयोगी यावानर्थराशिः प्रसक्तानुप्रसक्त्या विचित्रास्वाद आपतितः तावन्मुखसन्धिः । — प्रं० ३, पृ० २३

नाट्यदर्पण

१६. अमात्येन सागरिका-चेष्टित-रूपं बीजं मुख-सन्धौ न्यस्तं वसन्तोत्सव-कामदेवपूजादिना तिरोहितत्वादीषल्लक्ष्यम् ।

— पृ० ५५

१७. अत्र मौर्ख्यदोषं छादयितुं विदूषकेणोच्यते तद् राज्ञो हास्यहेतुत्वान्नर्मद्युतिः ।

— पृ० ७६

१८ संकेतादिवार्ता श्रुत्वा कटकवितरणं तु दानम् ।

— पृ० ८२

१९. निश्चयरूपत्वादेव चोहरूपाया युक्तेर्भिद्यते ।

— पृ० ८४

२०. परस्परवञ्चनप्रवृत्तयोर्यस्य बुद्धिसहायादिबलाधिक्येन यत्कर्मान्तरमतिसंधातु समर्थं तत् कर्म ... अधिबलम् ।

— पृ० ८९

२१ भिनत्ति हृदयमिति तोटकम् ।

— पृ० ९१

२२. यद्यपि श्रमोद्वेगवितर्कादयो व्यभिचारिमध्ये लक्षयिष्यन्ते तथापि ... सन्ध्यङ्गावसरेऽपि लक्ष्यन्ते ।

— पृ० ९७

२३ क्रुद्धस्य प्रमार्जनं ... बुद्धिविभवादिशक्तिकार्यत्वेन सा शक्तिः ।

— पृ० १००

२४ अन्ये त्वस्य स्थाने युक्तिं पठन्ति ।

— पृ० १०२

२५ केचिदन्यतमाङ्गानङ्गीकारेण द्वादशाङ्गमेवैतं सन्धिमिच्छन्ति ।

— पृ० १०३

२६. योग्यतां च रसनिर्वेशकव्यवसायिनः प्रबन्धकवयो विदन्ति न पुनः ... मुक्तककवयः ।

— पृ० ११५

२७. इतिवृत्तस्याविच्छेदश्च रसपुष्टयर्थः विच्छेदे हि स्थाय्यादेस्त्रुटितत्वात् कुतस्त्यो रसास्वादः ।

— पृ० ११५

अभिनवभारती

१६. ... मुखे न्यस्तं भूमाविव बीजं अमात्येन सागरिकाचेष्टित वसन्तोत्सवकामदेवपूजादिना तिरोहितं नष्टमिव ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० २४

१७ अत्र हि मौर्ख्यदोषं छादयितुं यद्विदूषकेणोच्यते तद्राज्ञो हास्यजननमिति नर्मैव द्योतितं भवति ।

— ग्र० ३, पृ० ४४

१८. संकेतादिवार्ताः श्रुत्वा कटकस्य दानम् ।

— ग्र० ३ पृ० ४९

१९. अनुमानं निश्चयात्मकत्वादूह, उपायायुक्तेरन्यत्वात् ।

— ग्र० ३, पृ० ४९

२०. परस्परवंचनप्रवृत्तयोर्यस्यैवाधिक सहायबुद्ध्यादीनवलम्बयति स एव तमतिसंधातु ... समर्थं इति तदिदं कर्माधिबलम् ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ५१

२१. भिनत्ति यतो हृदयं ततस्तोटकम् ।

— ग्र० ३, पृ० ५६

२२. यद्यपि श्रमोद्वेगवितर्कलज्जाप्रभृतयो व्यभिचारिवर्गे ... सन्ध्यङ्गत्वेनोक्ताः ।

— ग्र० ३, पृ० ५५

२३ कुपितस्य प्रशमः प्रसादन शक्तिः बुद्धिविभवादिशक्तिकार्यत्वात् ।

२४. युक्तिरित्यन्ये इदमङ्ग व्यवहरन्ति ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ५६

२५. केचिदत्रान्यतममङ्गं नाधीयन्ते द्वादशाङ्गमेवंतत्सन्धिमाहुः ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ५६

२६. योग्यतां च कविरेव जानाति न मुक्तककविः किन्तु प्रबन्धयोजनासमर्थः ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ६१

२७. इतिवृत्ताविच्छो(च्छेदो)ऽपि रसस्यैव पोषकः, अन्यथा विच्छेदे स्थाय्यादेस्त्रुटितत्वात् क रसवार्ता । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ६२

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
२८. एकाहचरितत्वाच्चैकाङ्कत्वमस्य । — पृ० १२३	२८ एकाहचरितविषयत्वात्त्वयायप्राप्तमेवात्रैकाङ्कत्वम् । — प्र० ३ पृ० ४४४
२९. यथा शाक्यानां स्त्रीसम्पर्को गर्हणीयो न चौर्यम् । — पृ० १२८	२९. शाक्यानां स्त्रीसम्पर्को गर्हणीयो न चौर्यम् । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४४९
३०. डिमो डिम्बो विप्लव इत्यर्थः, तद्योगादयं डिमः। — पृ० १३०	३०. डिमो डिम्बो विद्रव इति पर्यायाः । तद्योगादयं डिमः । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४४३
३१. उत्क्रमणोन्मुखा सृष्टिर्जीवितं यासां ता उत्सृष्टिकाः शोचन्त्यः स्त्रियस्ताभिरङ्कितत्वादुत्सृष्टिकाङ्कः । — पृ० १३०	३१. उत्क्रमणीया सृष्टिर्जीवितं प्राणा यासां वा उत्सृष्टिकाः शोचन्त्यः स्त्रियस्ताभिरङ्कित इति तथोक्त । — प्र० २, पृ० ४४६
३२. ईहा चेष्टा मृगस्येव स्त्रीमात्रार्थात्रेनीहामृगः । — पृ० १३१	३२. ईहा चेष्टा मृगस्येव स्त्रीमात्रार्था यत्र स ईहामृगः। — प्रं० २, पृ० ४४९
३३ प्रयोजनान्तरेण प्रयुक्तं यद् वचनं अन्यस्यान्यस्य हास्यवञ्चनारोषकारणं तत् ... छलम् । — पृ० १४२	३३. प्रयोजनान्तरमुद्दिश्य वचनमुच्यमानं कस्यचिद् वचनमन्यस्य हास्यपरस्य रोषं जनयति तच्छलम् । -- प्र० २, पृ० ४५७
३४. एतद्वचः सख्या भर्तृप्रत्यायनप्रयोजनेनोक्तं विदग्धजनस्य हास्यं श्वशुरादेर्वञ्चनं सपत्न्या रोषं जनयति । — पृ० १४३	३४. एतद्वचनं सखिसम्बन्धि भर्तृप्रत्यायनं प्रयोजनमुद्दिश्य प्रयुक्तं ... सम्बन्धिनां छलं विदग्धजनस्य हास्यं सपत्न्या वचनं रोषं जनयति । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४५८
३५. परविप्रतारणकारि ...यदुत्तरं हास्यनिमित्तं ... भवति सा नाली व्याजरूपा प्रणालिका । — पृ० १४६	३५. परविप्रतारणकारि यदुत्तरं अत एव हास्ययुक्ता सा नालिका प्रणालिका व्याजेत्यर्थः । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४५५
३६ विविधोऽर्थ आह्रियतेऽनयेति व्याहारः । — पृ० १३३	३६. स व्याहारः विविधोऽर्थोऽभिनीयते येन । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४५८
३७ गुणानां दोषत्वं दोषाणां च गुणत्वं ... इति मृदवम् । — पृ० १४७	३७. गुणानां दोषत्वं दोषाणां च गुणत्वं यत्र क्रियते तन्मृदवम् । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४५७
३८ अन्यकार्यकरणव्याजेन सम्पत्तिर्यत्र तदन्यकार्यावलगनादवलगितम् । — पृ० १४९	३८. अन्यानुसन्धानपूर्वकेऽप्यन्यत्कार्यं सिद्ध्यति तदन्यकार्यावलगनादवलगितम् । — प्रं० २, पृ० ४५४
३९ आधर्षो वाचा न्यक्कारः । — पृ० १५६	३९. आधर्षणं वाचा न्यक्कारः । — प्रं० ३, पृ० १७

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
४०. सत् सत्त्वं प्रकाशस्तद् यत्रास्ति तत् सत्त्वं मनस्तत्र भवा सात्वती ... । — पृ० १५६	४०. सत् सत्त्व प्रकाशः तद्विद्यते यत्र तत् सत्त्वं मनः तस्मिन्भवः । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ९६
४१. ... विचित्रं नेपथ्यं, वेणीसंहारे अश्वत्थाम्नः। ... मायाशिरोदर्शनं रामाभ्युदये । — पृ० १५८	४१. ... मायाशिरोनिक्षेपे रामाभ्युदये विचित्रं नेपथ्य, यथा वाश्वत्थाम्नः वेण्याम् । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० १०४
४२ अयं च हास्यो रसः प्रायो बाहुल्येनाधमप्रकृतौ पामरप्राये भवति । ... एवं करुणभयानकबीभत्साद्भुता अप्यधमप्रकृतौ भूयस्त्वमनुभवन्ति । पामरप्रायः सर्वः प्रकर्षेण हसति शोचति बिभेति परनिन्दामाद्रियते ... । — पृ० १६७	४२. हासादीनां तु ... न प्राधान्यम् । अत एवानुत्तमप्रकृतिषु बाहुल्येन हासादयो भवन्ति। पामरप्रायः सर्वोऽपि शोचति बिभेति परनिन्दामाद्रियते । — ग्र० १, पृ० २८२
४३ रागः प्रियतमं प्रति बहुमान । ...हर्षः सौभाग्यगर्वे। अन्यथा वक्तव्येऽन्यथा वचनम्, हस्तेनादातव्ये पादेनादानम् कटियोग्यस्य कण्ठे निवेशनमित्यादिकः ..। — पृ० २०५	४३ सौभाग्यगर्वकृतः विभ्रमः तद्यथा .. अन्यथा वक्तव्येऽन्यथा भाषणम्, हस्तेनादानव्ये पादेनादानम्, रशनायाः कण्ठे न्यास इत्यादि । ... रागः प्रियतमं प्रति बहुमानः हर्षः...। — ग्रं० ३, पृ० १६०

III. *Borrowing of Ideas*

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
१. न तत्र कैशिकी। न खलु ... काममात्रं शृङ्गारः किन्तु विलासोत्कर्षः । — पृ० २६	१ यत्र यत्रानुल्बणा चित्तवृत्तिः सा सा कैशिकीत्याशयः । — ग्रं० २, पृ० ४५२
२. वर्तमाने च नेतरि रसहानिः स्यात् । — पृ० २७	२ तेन वर्तमानराजचरित चावर्णनीयमेव । — ग्र० २, पृ० ४१३
३. देवतानां दुरुपपादस्याप्यर्थस्येच्छामात्रत एव सिद्धिरिति ... न मर्त्यानामुपदेशयोग्यम् । — पृ० २७	३. देवचरितं ... वरप्रभावादिबहुलतयोपायोपदेशायोग्यमिति । — ग्र० २, पृ० ४१२
४. रामप्रबन्धेषु सुग्रीवमैत्री-शरणागतरक्षण-रावणवध-सीताप्रत्यानयनादिषु सीताप्रत्यानयनस्यैव प्राधान्य कविना प्रतिपादितम् । — पृ० ३०	४. रावणोद्धरणं शरणागतविभीषणरक्षणमित्याद्यपि प्रधानफले सीताप्रत्यानयनलक्षणे विवक्षिते ... । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ३
५. जनानामेकस्यैव गोप्यत्वात् ... जनान्तिकम् । ... यद्विपरीतमपवारितम् । — पृ० ३१	५. ... एक एव शृणुयादिति तदपवारितं जनान्तिकं एकान्तिकत्व चैकस्यैव निगूहनात् इति विशेषः । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० २८१

नाट्यदर्पण

६. गोपुच्छस्य च केशाः केचित् स्तोकमात्र-व्यापिनः केचिन्मध्यावधयः केचिदन्तव्यापिनः। एवं प्रबन्धवस्तुन्यपि ... ।

— पृ० ३३

७ मर्यादायामाङ् ... यदा पुनरभिविधौ ... ।

— पृ० ४४

८. इह तावन्नायकसहायोभयेभ्यस्त्रिधा फलसिद्धिः।

— पृ० ४६

९. मुख्यफलं प्रति बीजाद्युपायान् प्रयोक्तुरवस्थाः प्रधानवृत्तविषये कायवाङ्मनसां व्यापाराः ।

— पृ० ४९

१०. प्रेक्षापूर्वकारिणां प्रथममारम्भस्ततः प्रयत्नः ।

— पृ० ४९

११. फले मुख्य तदर्थमौत्सुक्यमुपायविषयमनेनोपायेनैतत्सिध्यति इति स्मरणोत्कण्ठादिकर्म ... आरम्भः ।

— पृ० ४९–५०

१२. मुख्यफलोपायव्यापारणे त्वराऽनेनोपायेन विना फलं न भवतीति निश्चयेन परमौत्सुक्य ... प्रयत्नः ।

— पृ० ५०

१३ मात्रशब्देन फलान्तरयोगः प्रतिबन्धनिश्चयश्च व्यवच्छिद्यते । या सम्भावना न तु निश्चयः सा ... प्राप्त्याशा ।

— पृ० ५१

१४ प्रतिबन्धकाभावेन सकलसहकारिसम्पत्त्या कार्यस्य निश्चयो नियता फलाव्यभिचारिण्याप्तिर्नियताप्तिः ।

— पृ० ५२

१५. गर्भसन्धावप्राप्त्यंशः प्रधानफलसम्भावनात्मकत्वात् । अन्यथा फलनिश्चयात्मक एव स्यात्।

— पृ० ५६

१६. अल्पं विस्तारणं परिकरः ।

— पृ० ५६

अभिनवभारती

६. गोपुच्छे केचिद् बालाः ह्रस्वाः केचिद् दीर्घाः एवं कानिचित् कार्याणि मुखसन्धौ ... ।

— ग्रं० २, पृ० ४२८–९

७ अभिविधावाङ् । ये तु मर्यादायाम् ... ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० १८

८. तत्र प्रधानसिद्धिरायतसिद्धिरुभयसिद्धिः ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० १४

९. ... साध्ये व्यापारपरिस्पन्दो यो वाङ्मनसगतस्तस्य या अवस्था ... ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ६

१०. न हि प्रेक्षापूर्वकारिणः अवस्थान्तरासंभावनायां प्रारम्भः उचितः भवति ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ६

११. प्रधानभूतस्य फलस्य ... यद्बीजमुपायसम्पत्तस्य यदौत्सुक्यमात्रं तद्विषयस्मरणोत्कण्ठानुरूपम्, अनेनोपायेनैतत्सिद्ध्यतीति प्रारम्भः ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ६

१२. फलमुद्दिश्य यो व्यापारः उपायविषयपरमौत्सुक्यगमनलक्षणे तेन विनेदं फलं न भवति तस्मात् स एवोपायः ... प्रयत्नः ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ७

१३. तस्य सहकार्यन्तरयोगः प्रतिबन्धकारणं च मात्रपदेनावधारितम्। ... फलप्राप्तिः सम्भावनामात्रेण...स्थाप्यते न तु निश्चीयते तदा प्राप्ते संभवः ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ७

१४. फलस्य प्रकर्षेणाप्तिर्यतः सहकारिवर्गः प्रतिबन्धकविध्वंसनसहितता ... च सामग्रीरूपता यदा ... नियतां फलाव्यभिचारिणीं पश्यति तदा नियतफलप्राप्तिर्नामावस्था ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ७

१५. अप्राप्त्यंशश्चात्रावश्यंभावी, अन्यथा सम्भावनात्मा प्राप्तिसम्भवः कथं निश्चय एव स्यात्।

— ग्रं० ३ पृ० २६

१६. ईषद् विस्तार्यते परिकरः ।

— ग्रं० ३, पृ० ३८

नाट्यदर्पण	अभिनवभारती
१७. केचित्तु मुखादयः सन्धयोऽवस्थाश्च यत्र पृथक् पृथक्... उल्लिख्यन्ते त निर्वहणसन्धिमाहुः । — पृ० ५८	१७ अत्र केचिदमून् सर्वान् सन्धीन् अवस्था-पञ्चकनिर्वहणे पृथक्त्वयायोज्यमानामिच्छन्ति । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० २९
१८. कामफले च रूपके ... शृङ्गारः प्रतिमुखे विलासेन स एव विस्तार्यते । — पृ० ७०	१८ कामफलेषु रूपकेषु प्रतिमुख एव ... रतिरूपेण भाव्यम् । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ४२
१९. युक्तेः ... नियताकारतया अस्य भेदः । — पृ० ८३	१९. युक्तिस्तु नियतप्रतिपत्तिपर्यन्तेति विशेषः । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ४८
२० यतः शुद्धसङ्कीर्णभेदत्रयरूपं सप्तभेदं प्रकरणम् । — पृ० ११९	२०, सप्तविधस्यापि प्रकरणस्य प्रत्येकं भेदत्रयम् ...। — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ४३२
२१ तयो· प्रत्येक प्रसिद्धयप्रसिद्धिभ्यां चातुर्भेदत्वा-न्नाटिकापि चतुर्विधा । — पृ० १२१	२१. देवी कन्या च ख्याताख्यातभेदेन चतुर्धा । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ४२
२२. न नाम ... कोऽप्येकाकी कायिको वाचिको मानसो वा व्यापारो लक्ष्यते । कायिक्यो हि व्यापृतयो मानसैर्वाचिकैश्च व्यापारैः सम्भिद्यन्ते । ... (इत्यादि) — पृ० १५२	२२. वाङ्मनःकायचेष्टांशेषु न ह्येकोऽपि कश्चि-च्चेष्टांशोऽस्ति । कायचेष्टा अपि हि मानसीभिः सूक्ष्माभिश्च वाचिकीभिश्चेष्टाभिर्व्याप्यन्त एव।... (इत्यादि) — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ९१
२३. सर्वरसानां चाभासा अनौचित्यप्रवृत्तत्वाद् हास्यरसस्य कारणम् । — पृ० १८४	२३ अनौचित्यप्रवृत्तिकृतमेव हि हास्यविभावत्वम् । — ग्रं० १, पृ० २९७
२४ व्यभिचारिणामप्युत्पाद्योत्पादकभावः । — पृ० १८६	२४. व्यभिचारिणामप्येषैव वार्ता । — ग्रं० १, पृ० १९७
२५ विशिष्टविभावलाभे रतिप्रकर्षाद् देहविकाराः स्वाभाविकाः । — पृ० २०४	२५ विशिष्टविभावलाभे रतौ सविशेषत्वेन ... देहविकाराः । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० ३५८
२६. ... परस्परसमुत्थिता अपि भवन्ति । तथा हि कुमारीशरीरे प्रौढतमकुमारगतभावहाव-हेलादर्शनश्रवणाभ्यां भावादयो ... भवन्ति। ... (इत्यादि) — पृ० २०४–५	२६. परस्परसमुत्थिता भवन्ति । तथा हि कुमारी-शरीरे प्रौढतमकुमार्यन्तरगतहेलावलोकने सति ... भावस्यैवोद्भवः । ... (इत्यादि) — ग्रं० ३, पृ० १५५
२७. तद्भावभावनात्मकरागवशादङ्गमर्दनपर्यन्त यो-षितः चेष्टितम् । — पृ० २०६	२७. योषितो लीलादि तद्भावभावनवशादङ्गमर्दन-पर्यन्तम् ... मोट्टायितम् । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० १६१
२८. ... औज्ज्वल्यस्य मन्दमध्यतीव्रावस्थाः क्रमेण शोभाकान्तिदीप्तयः । — पृ ०२०७	२८. कान्तिदीप्तिशोभानां क्रमेण सातिशयमाह । — ग्रं० ३, पृ० १६३

It is not always that the authors of the ND follow Abhinava. Sometimes the view of Abhinava is referred to as the view of some (Kecit), e.g., Abhinava holds that Praveśaka should not occur at the beginning of the first Act[1]. The ND refers to this view as the view of 'some'[2]. Another instance of the same type is as under –

The ND refers to the view of Abhinava about Dyuti, viz., Krodhāder arthasya prāptasyāpi yat praśamanaṁ sā dyutiḥ (III, p. 58) has been referred to by the ND as the view of some. Cf. Apare tu krodhādeḥ prāptasya śamanaṁ dyutiṁ āmananti – (ND, p. 108).

This detailed comparison will prove beyond any shadow of doubt that the authors of the ND have considerably drawn on Abhinava. It is rather strange that the authors of the ND should not acknowledge their debt to Abhinava. They do not refer to Abhinava at all. What is more extraordinary is the fact that our authors criticize Abhinava on a minor point on one occasion and then alone mention him by name. The occasion is the etymology of Nāṭaka from the root Naṭ (to dance)[3]. The ND opines that it should be derived from 'Nāṭ' and not 'Naṭ' as Abhinava does.

The above criticism of the ND is not properly justified. Apart from the theoretical justification of the criticism (which too lacks sound reasoning and propriety) it is wanting in the spirit of fair play in the sense that they refer to Abhinava only to criticize. We feel as if the authors of the ND have picked up this unique opportunity to find fault with this great writer whose learning, judgement and erudition are beyond question.

At the same time it is obvious that the authors of the ND have sufficient respect for Abhinava. Even when they want to criticize, the criticism is so mild. Look at the above-mentioned criticism also which is put in a very mild tone.[4]

We should also note a few points to the credit of the ND. Inspite of the fact that the authors of the ND have abundantly drawn upon Abhi. there is no blind imitation anywhere. The above-mentioned instance where the authors of the ND have criticized Abhinava shows their free thinking. Authors of the ND have often tried to simplify the Abhi. The Abhi. is at times obscure and lacks in perspicuity. The ND here substitutes simple words for the difficult ones. The ND

1. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 434.
2. ND, 39.
3. Abhi. Vol. II, p. 413.
4. Vide – Ghaṭādivad hrasvābhāvaś *cintyaḥ* – ND, p. 28.

adds some words to make the sense clearer where the Abhi. has been too brief. On certain occasions the ND expands the idea expressed so briefly or concisely by the Abhi.[1] Where the Abhi. enters into scholastic and lengthy discussion the ND summarizes the passage and puts the gist in a simple language. At times what Abhinava means to say is put in a better polished language by the ND. For instance, the time duration suggested by each of the five Arthopakṣepakas is very briefly but adequately and aptly stated by the ND refraining from the scholastic and lengthy discussion in which the Abhi. enters[2]. At times the ND adds a number of illustrations to make the point clearer, e. g., the discussion of the ND on the five Avasthās is much similar to that of the Abhi. with the only difference that the ND abundantly supplies illustrations to elucidate each while the Abhi. does not.

The ND can be useful to us from another point of view also. Since the ND often follows the Abhi. word for word the ND can help us in settling the text of the Abhinavabhāratī at some places where it is corrupt. We know that the text of the Abhi. is not so pure and requires correction at places. The ND can help us here. The following instances will be enough to illustrate the point :

(i) The Abhi. on Adhibala reads as follows -

" Parasparа*vacana*pravṛttayor yasyaivādhikaṁ..." etc. (III, p. 51) Here the ND reads the same as Paraspara*vañcana*pravṛttayor yasya..." etc. (p 89). Here the ND reads ' vañcana ' instead of ' vacana ' which appears to be a better and correct reading.

(ii) " *Aṅkasamāptāyāṁ* api vā avasthāyāṁ yadā bījasya saṁharṇaṁ bhavati tadāpyankacchedeḥ ". Abhi II, 416. This is rightly emended by the ND as -

Asamāptāyāṁ api avasthāyāṁ kāryavaśena yo vā cchedaḥ so 'ṅkaḥ - ND, p. 34.

(iii) " *Vasantasenāṁ* uddiśya *mādhavasya* uktiḥ " - Abhi. II, p. 433 is rightly corrected by the ND as -

" *Mādhavasenām* uddiśya *candragupta*syoktiḥ - ND, p. 118.

1. Cf. Abhi. :- Yathā ratnāvalyāṁ...amātyasya vīro, vatsarājasya śṛṅgārādbhutau tataḥ śṛṅgāra iti .. (Vol. III, p. 24) has been better elucidated by the ND thus :-

Yathā ratnāvalyām...*amātya-yaugandharāyaṇasya pṛthvī-sāmrājyavijigīṣor* vīraḥ, vatsa-rājasya *vasantavibhāvaḥ śṛṅgāraḥ, paurapramodāvalokanād* adbhutaḥ, tata udayanāgamanād ārabhya punaḥ śṛṅgāraḥ .. ND, p. 54.

Abhinava has not explained how Yaugandharāyaṇa has Vīra and Vatsarāja has Śṛṅgāra and Adbhuta.

2. Cf. Abhi. Vol. II, pp. 422-23 and ND, p. 41.

(iv) Similarly "yathā māyāśiro*nikṣepe* rāmābhyudaye citraṁ nepathyaṁ, yathā vāśvatthāmnaḥ (Veṇyāṁ) " (Abhi. III, p. 104) may be rightly amended in the light of the ND, p. 158, as -

"Yathā māyāśiro*nikṣepo* rāmābhyudaye, citraṁ nepathyaṁ yathā aśvatthāmnaḥ..." etc.

(v) The Abhi. defines Viṣkaṁbhaka as " *Viṣkaṁbhayati* upastaṁbhayatīti viṣkaṁbhakaḥ ". The root here is obviously 'skaṁbh' with 'vi', which belongs to 1st, 5th and 9th conjugation. It is not possible to understand why Abhinava puts its causal form when that sense is not needed. The ND, therefore, reads, "*Viṣkabhnāti* vṛttaṁ upaṣṭambhayatīti viṣkaṁbhakaḥ."

(vi) " *Dṛṣṭārtha*garbhatvāt, gaṇḍa iva gaṇḍaḥ "... Abhi. II, p. 458 may easily be corrected in the light of the ND -

"*Duṣṭārtha*garbhatvād duṣṭaśoṇitagarbhagaṇḍa iva gaṇḍaḥ"[1] p. 138.

(iii) *The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Daśarūpaka*

It becomes highly interesting to study the mutual relation between the ND and the DR (along with 'Avaloka' of Dhanika) especially when we do not find the mention of the name of the DR or its author even once throughout the work. Nevertheless a deeper comparative study of the two texts makes it abundantly clear that the authors of the ND do have the DR in mind while writing the work. The DR by its brevity and by the compact, precise and systematic treatment of the subject had won such tremendous popularity, that no later writer on dramaturgy could afford to ignore it. Dhanañjaya had a place next only to Bharata[2]. So it is not possible to imagine that the authors of the ND did not take note of this important treatise. On the contrary, it appears that the DR remained continuously before the mental eye of our authors in the course of writing this work. In fact, the authors of the ND have modelled their work on the DR. (They chose to discuss mostly those topics which had been treated of by the DR.)

At the outset the very form of the ND seems to have been modelled upon the DR. The DR is divided into four chapters called Prakāśa, the ND also is divided into four chapters called Vivekas. In both, Kārikās are composed in Anuṣṭubh metre (in an aphoristic style). The authors of the ND then add a lucid commentary to these Kārikās in order to elucidate what they had so briefly stated in Kārikās. Thus the form resembles the DR together with its commentary called Avaloka.

1. It may also be noted here that by using the adjective "duṣṭaśoṇitagarbha" to 'gaṇḍa' the ND has nicely clarified the analogy, so briefly stated by Abhinava.
2. Vide Trans. of DR by Hall (Intro.).

Of course, the difference here is that in the DR Kārikās and Vṛtti are by two different hands, while in the ND the authors of both, the Kārikā and the Vṛtti, are the same.

In the beginning, they offer salutation to the 'Jainī vāk' having twelve forms. The idea might have been suggested by the salutation offered by the DR to Viṣṇu having ten forms or incarnations.[1] This reference to ten incarnations of Viṣṇu made by the DR must have led the Jainas to think out another number which should be connected with their religion, and this number was twelve, the number of their principal Aṅga texts which constitute their Āgama (Canon).

While explaining the technical terms the DR often offers an etymological explanation thinking that knowledge of the root and its component parts would give a better idea of the meaning of the term. The ND too follows this method in many cases.

On a comparison of the two works it is evident that there is similarity between the two works which ranges from the verbal identity to the similarity of ideas, etc. The treatment of this comparative study, therefore, may be divided into the following headings :—

(A) Similarity of treatment or order.

(B) Similarity of sentences.

(C) Similarity of phrases.

(D) Similarity of illustrations.

(E) Similarity of ideas.

(A) *Similarity of Treatment*

Treatment is more or less similar. As has already been pointed out the form of the ND is clearly modelled on that of the DR. The first chapter (Viveka) of the ND very much resembles the first chapter of the DR both treating of similar topics such as the types of drama, divisions of plot, Avasthā, Arthaprakṛti, Saṁdhi, Saṁdhyaṅgas, Arthopakṣepakas, Nāṭyoktis etc. The second chapter of the ND can be well compared with the third one of the DR, both treating of the types of drama, their definitions, and the Vīthyaṅgas. Of course, the treatment of Vṛtti which is found here in the DR is given by the ND in the beginning of the next chapter. Moreover, the treatment of Nāṭaka and Aṅka found here in the DR is given by the ND in the previous chapter. The third chapter of the ND and the fourth of the DR mainly deal with Rasa and Bhāva. The ND includes two more topics, viz., Vṛtti and

1. Cf. ND I, 1 and DR I, 2.

Abhinaya, the latter of which is untouched by the DR. The fourth chapter of the ND which is a miscellany has much in common with the second chapter of the DR, which treats of the types of characters, qualities of a hero, types of heroines, qualities of heroines, friends (or helpmates) of heroines, language or dialect to be spoken by different characters and modes of address. The ND treats of Nāndī and Dhruvā which are not dealt with by the DR.

This will make it clear that the ND has mostly chosen for discussion those topics which have been treated of by the DR (barring the three topics, viz., Nāndī, Dhruvā and Abhinaya). The Kārikās of the ND are brief and rather more lucid and simple.

These Kārikās are accompanied by an explanation in the commentary (in the DR the task is accomplished by Dhanika) which also contains illustrations.

(B) *Similarity of Sentences*

नाट्यदर्पण	दशरूपक
१. परावृत्य रहस्याख्याऽन्यस्मै तदपवारितम् । १, १२.	१. रहस्यं ख्यायतेऽन्यस्मै परावृत्यापवारितम् । १, १६६.
२ अङ्कास्यमन्तपात्रेण छिन्नाङ्कमुखयोजनम् । १, २६.	२. अङ्कान्तपात्रैरङ्कास्य छिन्नाङ्कस्यार्थसूचनात् । १, ६२.
३. बीजस्योक्तिरुपक्षेपः । १, ४३.	३. बीजन्यास उपक्षेपः । १, २७
४ इत्यत्र पूर्वाङ्कान्त एव प्रविष्टेन सुमन्त्रपात्रेण शतानन्दजनककथार्थविच्छेदे उत्तराङ्कमुख-सूचनाद् अङ्कास्यमिति । पृ. ५९.	४ इत्यत्र पूर्वाङ्कान्त एव प्रविष्टेन सुमन्त्रपात्रेण शतानन्दजनककथार्थविच्छेदे उत्तराङ्कमुख-सूचनादङ्कास्यम् । पृ ३२.
५. अग्राम्य इष्टावर्जनरूपो वाग्वेशचेष्टाभिः परि-हासो नर्म । पृ. १५७.	५ अग्राम्य इष्टावर्जनरूपः परिहासो नर्म । पृ. ५७.
६ उदयनचरिते किलिञ्जहस्तिप्रयोगः । पृ. १२८.	६. यथोदयनचरिते किलिञ्जहस्तिप्रयोगः । पृ. ६०.

(C) *Similarity of Phrases*

नाट्यदर्पण	दशरूपक
१. धीरोद्धतश्चलश्चण्डो दर्पी दम्भी विकत्थनः । १, ८.	१. धीरोद्धतस्त्वहङ्कारी चलश्चण्डो विकत्थनः । २, ५.
२ धीरोदात्तोऽतिगम्भीरो न्यायी सत्त्वी क्षमी स्थिरः । १, ८अ.	२. महासत्त्वोऽतिगम्भीरो क्षमावानविकत्थनः । २, ८.
३ वस्तुनः सूचनं चूला पात्रैर्नेपथ्यसंस्थितैः । १, २६.	३. अन्तर्जवनिकासंस्थैश्चूलिकार्थस्य सूचना । १, ६१.
४. फलायौत्सुक्यमारम्भः । १, ३५.	४. औत्सुक्यमात्रमारम्भः फललाभाय भूयसे । १, २०.
५. भाणोक्तसन्धिवृत्त्यङ्गो वाग्युद्धः करुणाङ्गिकः । १, ८८.	५. रसस्तु करुणः स्थायी ... भाणवत्सन्धि-वृत्त्यङ्गैर्युक्तः ...... । ३, ७१.
६. नियुद्धादि तु रामायणीयेष्विन्द्रजिल्लक्ष्मणयो-रिति । पृ, १५८.	६. सम्फेटस्तु इन्द्रजिल्लक्ष्मणयोश्च रामायणप्रति-बद्धवस्तुषु । पृ. ६८.

(D) *Similarity of Illustrations*

The illustrations cited to illustrate the following are common to the ND and the DR -

	Illustration	ND	DR
(i)	Aṅkāsya	ND p. 39	DR pp. 32-33.
(ii)	Aṅkāvatāra	ND p. 40	DR p. 33.
(iii)	Bīja	ND p. 42	DR p. 5.
(iv)	Prayatna	ND pp. 50-51	DR pp. 5-6.
(v)	Pratimukha	ND p. 55	DR p. 11.
(vi)	Upakṣepa	ND p. 60	DR p. 7.
(vii)	Karaṇa	ND p. 63	DR p. 10.
(viii)	Prāpaṇa or Prāpti	ND pp. 65-66	DR p. 8.
(ix)	Vidhāna	ND p. 67	DR p. 9.
(x)	Saṁpheṭa	ND p. 93-94	DR p. 22.
(xi)	Prarocanā	ND p. 102	DR pp. 25-26.
(xii)	Sandhi	ND p. 104	DR p. 27.
(xiii)	Grathana	ND p. 105	DR p. 28.
(xiv)	Kṛti	ND p. 107	DR p. 30.
(xv)	Pūrvabhāva	ND p. 112	DR p. 30.
(xvi)	Kāvyasaṁhāra	ND p. 113	DR p. 31.
(xvii)	Vyāhāra	ND p. 133-4	DR p. 69.
(xviii)	Gaṇḍa	ND p. 138	DR p. 67.

(xix)	Mṛdava					
	ND	p.	149	DR	p.	69.
(xx)	Udghātyaka					
	ND	p.	149	DR	p.	65.
(xxi)	Avalagita					
	ND	p.	149	DR	p.	66.
(xxii)	Avaspandita					
	ND	p.	150-1	DR	p.	68.
(xxiii)	Āmukha					
	ND	p.	154	DR	p.	64.
(xxiv)	Āmukha					
	ND	p.	154	DR	p.	65.
(xxv)	Āmukha					
	ND	p.	155	DR	p.	65.
(xxvi)	Narma (verbal)					
	ND	p.	157	DR	p.	57.
(xxvii)	Narma (of dress)					
	ND	p.	157	DR	p.	57.
(xxviii)	Narma (of action)					
	ND	p.	157	DR	p.	57.

These illustrations along with the illustrations quoted by the ND while mentioning the view of the DR number about fifty. This large number indicates to what extent the authors of the ND have borrowed from the Daśarūpakāvaloka of Dhanika.

At times a particular illustration is given by the DR to illustrate one particular point while the same is quoted by the ND in an altogether different context to illustrate just some other point,[1] e. g,

(i) The RTN I, 23 etc. (ND, p. 45) is given by the ND as an illustration of the third type of Patākāsthānaka while the DR gives it as an illustration of Bindu (DR, p. 5).

(ii) The Veṇī. I, 26 which is quoted by the ND (p. 61) as an illustration of Parinyāsa is given by the DR as an illustration of Samādhāna (DR, p. 8).

(iii) The Veṇī. I, 24 which is quoted by the DR (p. 61) as an illustration of Udbheda is quoted by the ND as that of Samāhiti (ND, p. 62).

1. This should not lead us to think that the following instances show any inherent contradiction between the two. It is possible that one and the same verse can serve the purpose of both. It depends upon how one looks at it.

At times the DR gives a particular piece from a work to illustrate one point while the ND. quotes just a different piece from the same work to illustrate the same, e. g.,

(i) Narma is illustrated by both the works from the RTN only but the quotations are different.[1]

(ii) Quite similar is the case with Narmadyuti also[2].

(iii) The illustration of Saṁgraha of the ND and the DR, though both from the RTN, are different[3].

(iv) The illustrations of Udāhṛti given by the ND and the DR, although both from the RTN, are different[4].

(v) The illustration of Udvega given by the ND from the Veṇī. is much similar to that of the DR from the same work but not the same[5]. Illustration from the RTN given by both are also slightly different[6].

(E) *Similarity of Ideas*

As regards the similarity of ideas there are innumerable instances. The reason is that both the ND and the DR draw amply upon the NS of Bharata. Naturally therefore there will be a remarkable similarity between the two works so far as ideas are concerned.

It is evident that the authors of the ND have not always accepted the DR. At times they do differ; but, whenever and wherever they differ they do mention the view of the DR under 'Kecit', 'Anye' or "Eke". If they find the DR's view to be incorrect or faulty they do not fail to criticize it offering their own arguments. Below are quoted some of the instances where the ND differs from the DR and criticizes it.

1. While discussing the hero of a Nāṭaka, the ND refers to the view of those who propound that the hero of Nāṭaka should be of Dhīrodātta type only and remarks that they do not follow the tradition of the poets who have employed Dhīralalita and other types of the hero in a Nāṭaka[7]. The view criticized clearly refers to the DR[8].

---

1. ND, p. 74; DR, p. 13.
   But this is also quite possible as Narma and others can be used more than once in a play.
2. ND, pp. 75-76. DR, p. 13.
3. ND, p. 82; DR, p. 18.
4. ND, p. 85; DR, p. 17.
5. ND, p. 87; DR, p. 20.
6. ND, p. 87; DR, p. 20.
7. ND, p. 29.
8. DR III, 22.

2. While discussing the hero of Prakaraṇa the ND remarks -

" He who holds that the hero of a Prakaraṇa should be of Dhīraśānta type thinking that a minister, a Brahmin and a merchant are of Dhīraśānta nature is violating the ancient tradition."[1] The ND here quotes from the NS itself to the effect that an army-commander and a minister are of Dhīrodātta type."[2]

It is noteworthy here that in the points of difference, the ND generally refers to the old tradition which is highly honoured by our authors, even though they do not always follow it.

At many a place the authors of the ND differ from the view of the DR. On such occasions they simply state the view of the DR under 'Kecit', 'Anye' or 'Apare' without making any comments on such views. The following are the instances :-

(i)	Definition of Udbheda			
	ND	pp. 62-63.	DR	I, 29c.
(ii)	Definition of Bhedana			
	ND	pp. 64-65.	DR	I, 29d.
(iii)	Definition of Varṇasaṁhāra			
	ND	p. 73.	DR	I, 35cd.
(iv)	Definition of Narmadyuti			
	ND	p. 76.	DR	I, 33d pp. 13-14.
(v)	Definition of Rūpa			
	ND	p. 83.	DR	I, 39a.
(vi)	Non-recognition of Prārthanā as a Sandhyaṅga			
	ND	p. 85.		
(vii)	Definition or Krama			
	ND	p. 86.	DR	I, 39c.
(viii)	Non-acceptance of Chādana and mentioning Chalana instead			
	ND	p. 95.	DR	I, 46d. (p, 24)
(ix)	Definition of Dyuti			
	ND	p. 96.	DR	I, 46b.
(x)	Non-recognition of Kheda and Virodha and reading Vidrava and Vicalana instead.			
	ND	p. 98.	DR	I, 45c, 48a.
(xi)	Definition of Śakti			
	ND	p. 100.	DR	I, 46a.

1. ND, p. 117. Here the reference to the view in singular number is unusual and significant as it clearly refers to Dhanañjaya (Vide DR III, 39-40).
2. NS (KM) XXIV, 4.

(xii)	Definition of Vyavasāya			
	ND	p. 103.	DR	I, 47a.
(xiii)	Definition of Paribhāṣā			
	ND	p. 106.	DR	I, 52a.
(xiv)	Definition of Adhibala			
	ND	p. 137.	DR	III, 18ab.
(xv)	Definition of Prapañca			
	ND	p. 140 lines 8-9.	DR	III, 15cd.
(xvi)	Definition of Vākkelī			
	ND	p. 146.	DR	III, 17cd.
(xvii)	Definition of Asatpralāpa			
	ND	p. 145.	DR	III, 20ab.
(xviii)	Definition of Nālikā			
	ND	p. 146.	DR	III, 19cd.
(xix)	Definition of Avalagita			
	ND	p. 150.	DR	III, 15ab.
(xx)	Non-recognition of Śānta in drama			
	ND	p. 170.	DR	IV, 35 and Avaloka on it.
(xxi)	Considering the MṚC as a mixed type of Prakarana.			
	ND	p. 119.	DR p.	72.

The above list will show how the ND has not missed any opportunity to quote the view of the DR wherever the ND's explanation has differed from the DR. The ND has retained the same wording as found in the DR. The definitions are also followed by the same illustrations as are given by Dhanika in the Avaloka. It is only in the definition of Nālikā that strangely enough the ND has quoted an illustration different from the one in the DR.

When we compare these two works we naturally find that the ND is superior to the DR in a few respects.

(1) The DR is often too brief. This brevity has been achieved at times at the cost of clarity of expression. But for the invaluable commentary of Dhanika the DR would have been almost incomprehensible at some places Even the commentary of Dhanika is not of much help. In spite of the commentary the text remains unintelligible at some places. At times obscure words or phrases are not elucidated. The commentator sometimes disposes of the topic with only one word 'Spaṣṭaṁ'. Kārikās in the ND too are brief quite in keeping with the aphoristic style, but at the same time perfectly clear.

(2) At times the DR is obscure, The obscurity is due to clumsy expression or construction or the use of a word in a peculiar sense

different from its general sense. On the other hand, the ND has maintained commendable simplicity throughout the work.

(3) The DR usually mentions only one view- the view which Dhanañjaya holds. Very rarely the DR mentions or criticizes the views of its predecessors. The ND, on the other hand, mentions the views of the earlier writers and even comments upon them wherever the authors feel it necessary. Thus we get a better and complete picture of the topic at hand.

(4) The ND supplies the reader with a number of illustrations. Where the DR is satisfied by giving only one illustration, the ND sometimes gives two and at times even three; for instance, in case of Narma, the ND gives as many as six illustrations while the DR gives only two. Similarly, four illustrations are cited to explain Vajra. And we all know the importance of illustrations in clarifying the abstract ideas.

(5) Some of the minor topics concerning dramatics like Nāndī, Dhruvās, the names of the different characters, etc. find a treatment in the ND though not in the DR The DR has totally left out Abhinaya which forms a very important element of drama.

(6) In the ND the treatment of all the topics is highly systematic while at times the DR may be accused of unsystematic treatment, e. g. in the treatment of Arthaprakṛtis the DR seems to be quite unsystematic. In the beginning the DR divides the plot into two- principal and subordinate; the latter is subdivided into Patākā and Prakarī. Then the DR gives another division of plot into well-known, imaginary and mixed, and defines each. Then it takes up Kārya for definition which is followed by the explanation of Bīja and Bindu and finally enumerates the Arthaprakṛtis. The right procedure should have been to enumerate first and then to define each in order of enumeration.

This comparison will be sufficient to prove that the ND, from the point of view of treatment of the subject, lucidity of style, clarity of expression, etc., is to some extent superior to the DR[1]. The ND is exhaustive and informative even though it does not enter into unnecessary details that would confuse the reader and abstains as far as possible from divisions and subdivisions which are often unnecessary and confusing.

It is likely that one of the purposes of the authors of the ND in writing this work was to excel the DR which must have won immense

1. This view has been supported also by M. Ghosh. Vide NS (Intro.) p. 89.

popularity in the days of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra[1]. From the comparative study of both the works it is evident that the authors have constantly kept the DR and the Avaloka commentary by Dhanika before them not only because it was an important work on dramaturgy but also because they aimed at surpassing it. The comparison undertaken above shows that they have been fairly successful in their task.

(iv) *The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Kāvyānuśāsana*

Our authors, Rāmacandra and Gunacandra, are known to be the pupils of Hemacandra, the author of the KS. That they show their regard towards their preceptor will be clear from what follows.

In the concluding verses of the work the authors of the ND express their feeling of reverence. Here they speak of their great "Guru" as an authority on different sciences[2]. In fact they are proud that they are the pupils of such a great Guru. Rāmacandra refers to himself as the pupil of Hemacandrācārya in several of his plays[3].

Moreover the ND has once quoted an aphorism from Hemacandra's grammar while explaining the grammatical formation of the word 'Vācika'[4].

Following Hemacandra, our authors pay homage to the Jainī vāk in the introductory verse of benediction[5]. We also find the ND echoing the KS when the former names the chapters as Vivekas after the KS.

The authors of the ND do not seem to have depended much upon the KS so far as the treatment of dramas is concerned as Hemacandra has very briefly treated of this topic and there too he has almost literally borrowed from the earlier authorities viz., Bharata and Abhinava. In the following instances we find some similarity of ideas between the ND and the KS; still however it is not possible to state categorically that the ND has borrowed them from the KS only as the KS itself has borrowed from the earlier sources.

1. Ācārya Viśveśvara opines that political rivalry might have worked in background for the composition of this work Dhanañjaya was the court-pandit of Mālavā while Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra were pandits of Gujarat. There was always a conflict between the two states and because of this rivalry the ND was possibly written in order to outvie the DR, it being a composition of a Mālava pandit.
— Hindi Nāṭyadarpaṇa (Intro.), p. 20
2. Śabda-pramāṇa-sāhitya-chandolakṣmavidhāyinām,
Śrīhemacandrapādānāṁ prasādāya namo namaḥ.– ND, p. 215.
3. Vide NLV: Prologue.
4. Prayojanam – Haima. 6, 4, 117; ND, p. 188.
5. ND, pp. 23 and 24.

नाट्यदर्पण	काव्यानुशासन
१. तथापि रामवद्वर्तितव्यं न रावणवदिति ... । — पृ० २५	१ ... रामादिवद्वर्तितव्यं न रावणादिवदित्युपदिशतीति । — पृ० ४
२. धर्मस्य च मोक्षहेतुतया मोक्षोऽपि पारम्पर्येण फलम् । — पृ० २५	२. द्रव्याद्यनुयोगानामपि मोक्षोऽपि पारम्पर्येण निःश्रेयसप्रयोजनत्वात् । — पृ० २
३. अथ शिष्टसमयपरिपालनाय ... समुचितेष्टाधिदैवतस्य सूत्रकारौ नमस्कारश्लोकं परामृशतः । — पृ० २४	३. शिष्टसमयपरिपालनाय शास्त्रकारः समुचितेष्टदेवतां प्रणिधत्ते । — पृ० १
४. स्थायिभावो रसः । — पृ० १५८	४. ... स्थायी भावो रसः । — पृ० ८८
५ ... परस्परावलोकनचुम्बनवक्रोक्त्यादिभेदतोऽनन्तप्रकारः । — पृ० १६४	५. स च परस्परावलोकनालिङ्गनचुम्बनपानाद्यनन्तभेदः । — पृ० १०९
६. क्वचिदकाण्डे प्रथनम् । यथा वेणीसंहारे ... दुर्योधनस्य भीष्मप्रमुखमहावीरलक्षक्षयकारिणि प्रवृत्ते समरसंरम्भे शृङ्गारवर्णनम् । — पृ० १०४	६. अकाण्डे प्रथनम् । यथा वेणीसंहारे द्वितीयेऽङ्के दुर्योधनस्य ... तथाभूतभीष्मप्रमुखमहावीरलक्षक्षयकारिणि समरसंरम्भे प्रवृत्ते शृङ्गारवर्णनम् । — पृ० १७०
७ क्वचिदकाण्डे विच्छेदो यथा वीरचरिते राघवभार्गवयोर्धाराधिरूढे वीररसे "कङ्कणमोचनाय गच्छामि" इति राघवस्योक्तिः । — पृ० १७४	७. अकाण्डे छेदो यथा रत्नावल्याम् ... । यथा वा वीरचरिते ... राघवभार्गवयोर्धाराधिरूढे वीररसे "कंकणमोचनाय गच्छामि" इति राघवस्योक्तौ । — पृ० १७१
८. अङ्गिनो . . रसस्य भिदनुसन्धानं दोषः । अनुसन्धिर्हि सर्वस्व रसपोषस्य ... । यथा रत्नावल्याम् चतुर्थेऽङ्के बाभ्रव्यागमनात् सागरिकाविस्मृतिरिति । — पृ० १७५	८. अङ्गिनः प्रधानस्याननुसन्धानं यथा रत्नावल्यां चतुर्थेऽङ्के बाभ्रव्यागमनेन सागरिकाया विस्मृति । अनुसन्धिर्हि सर्वस्वं सहृदयतायाः...। — पृ० १७१
९. ... धाराधिरूढस्यापि रसस्य पुनः पुनरुद्दीप्तिर्दोषो यथा कुमारसम्भवे रतिप्रलापेषु । लब्धपरिपोषो हि रसः पुनः पुनः परामृश्यमानो मालतीमाल्यमिव म्लायति । — पृ० १७५	९. पुनः पुनर्दीप्तिर्यथा कुमारसम्भवे रतिप्रलापेषु । उपभुक्तो हि रसः स्वसामग्रीलब्धपरिपोषः पुनः पुनः परामृश्यमानः परिम्लानकुसुमकल्पः कल्पत इति ।[1] — पृ० १७०
१०. तत्र कामस्य सर्वजातिसुलभतयाऽत्यन्तपरिचिततया च सर्वान् प्रति हृद्यतेति पूर्वं शृङ्गारः । ततः शृङ्गारानुगामित्वात् हास्यः । ततो हास्यविरोधित्वात् करुणः । ... ततोऽर्थप्रधानो रौद्रः । कामार्थयोर्धर्मजत्वात् ततो धर्मप्रधानो वीरः । अस्य च भीताभयप्रदानसारत्वात् ततो भयानकः । — पृ० १६३	१०. तत्र कामस्य सर्वजातिसुलभतयाऽत्यन्तपरिचितत्वेन सर्वान् प्रति हृद्यतेति पूर्वं शृङ्गारः । तदनुगामी च हास्यः । ... तद्विपरीतस्ततः करुणः । ततः ... अर्थप्रधानो रौद्रः । ततः कामार्थयोर्धर्ममूलत्वात् धर्मप्रधानो वीरः । तस्य भीताभयप्रदानसारत्वादनन्तरं भयानकः । — पृ० १०६

१. विवेक — रसस्य पुनः पुनःसंदोलनं मालतीकुसुमपरिमर्दनवदननुगुणमेव । धाराप्राप्ते हि रसे ... काव्यानुशासन, पृ० १७०

नाट्यदर्पण	काव्यानुशासन
११. पामरप्रायः सर्वः प्रकर्षेण हसति शोचति बिभेति परनिन्दामाद्रियते, स्वल्पेनापि सुभाषितेन सर्वत्र विस्मयते इति । — पृ० १६७	११. पामरप्रायः सर्वोऽपि हसति शोचति बिभेति परनिन्दामाद्रियते। स्वल्पसुभाषितत्वेन च सर्वत्र विस्मयते । — पृ० १०१
१२. नवनवोल्लेखशालिनी प्रज्ञा प्रतिभानम् । — पृ० १८०	१२. प्रज्ञा नवनवोल्लेखशालिनी प्रतिभा मता । — पृ० ३
१३. तेन शृङ्गारस्य नेमौ भेदौ शावलेयबाहुलेयावपि तु सस्त्रीकेऽपि विप्रलम्भसम्भावनासद्भावात् ... उभयसंवलितस्वभाव शृङ्गारः । ... [illegible] च सातिशयश्चमत्कारः । यथा — एकस्मिन् शयने पराङ्मुखतया वीतोत्तरं ... (इत्यादि) । — पृ० १६४	१३. तेन न शृङ्गारस्येमौ भेदौ गोत्वस्येव शावलेयबाहुलेयौ, अपि तु तद्दशाद्वयेऽप्यनुयायिनी या रतिः ... तस्याः स्वाद्यमानं रूपं शृङ्गारः । अत एव तद्द्वयोन्मीलन एव सातिशयश्चमत्कारः । यथा — एकस्मिन् शयने वीतोत्तरं ...... (इत्यादि) । — पृ० १०८

The definitions of Saṭṭaka and Goṣṭhī that we find in the ND and the KS are identical. The definitions of Hallīsaka and Śrīgadita also are similar in both. But these definitions are borrowed by the ND from the SP of Bhoja (and not from the KS).

Some illustrations are found to be common between the ND and the KS, e. g.

(i) Illustration of Śṛṅgāra
ND p. 164 KS pp. 108-9.

(ii) Illustration of Śṛṅgāra
ND p. 164 KS p. 113.

(iii) Illustration of Doṣas[1]
ND p. 176 KS p. 169.

(iv) Dantakṣatāni karajaiś ca etc.
ND p. 172 KS p. 167.

(v) Kṣipto hastāvalagnaḥ...etc.
ND pp. 172-3 KS p. 164.

There is one verse quoted from the Veṇī by both but in altogether different contexts. The KS (p. 116) quotes it to illustrate Raudra Rasa while the ND quotes it as an illustration of a Sandhyaṅga called [illegible].

At another place also the KS (p 128) quotes a verse ([illegible] śaśalakṣmaṇo ... etc.) to illustrate the mixture of Vyabhicāribhāvas. The ND quotes it to illustrate the case of contradictory Rasas.

1. The ND criticizes this example having quoted it.

At one place the KS (p. 167) has quoted only a quarter of the verse ' Ayam sa raśanotkarṣī...'etc., while the ND (p. 172) gives it in full.

The authors of the ND have not blindly imitated the KS At many places they have tried to improve upon the KS. The benedictory verse of the ND though praising the Jainī vāk appears more artistic and meaningful than that of the KS.

The ND accepts the number of Rūpakas as twelve in accordance with the KS; but it does not accept Saṭṭaka as the twelfth The ND substitutes it by Prakaraṇikā (probably because Saṭṭaka was purely a Prakrit play)[1]. Here the authors of the ND seem to be improving upon their teacher's view, which reveals their free thinking.

The ND, like the KS, does not divide the dramatic literature into Rūpaka and Uparūpaka. But while the KS divides the drama into Pāṭhya and Geya and calls the Uparūpaka as Geya Rūpaka, the ND divides the drama into Pradhānarasa Rūpaka and Apradhānarasa Rūpaka.

The most important deviation of the ND from the KS is found in the ND's peculiar theory of the dual nature of Rasa.[2] Hemacandra has followed the Abhi. and the KP in his discussion of Rasa. But Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra have boldly discarded the view of their preceptor and the great authorities like Bharata and others.

Moreover the ND admits of Rasas like Laulya, Sneha etc. over and above the principal nine though the KS refuses to accept them as independent Rasas and includes them under nine[3]. The ND refers to this view of the KS under " Kecit ".[4]

Similarly we come across a few instances where the ND goes to the extent of criticizing the KS under the usual " Kecit " . It is true that all the three of the below-mentioned views originally belong to the KP and that they are borrowed by Hemacandra from the same and so the criticism that follows is equally applicable to both, the KP and the KS, more rightly to the KP[5]. Still however it cannot be gainsaid that the authors of the ND disagree with the views of their preceptor even though their criticism may directly be aimed at others.

1. The probable reasons for substituting Prakaraṇikā in the place of Saṭṭaka are already discussed earlier in chapter I of the present work (p. 18).
2. ND, pp. 158-9.
3. Ete nava eva ... rasāḥ. Tena ... sneho rasaḥ ity asat .. etc — KS, p. 106.
4. Sambhavanty apare'pi ... kecid eṣām pūrveṣvantarbhāvam āhuḥ ... — ND, p. 163.
5. The tone here is slightly aggressive. Had the criticism been directed against their preceptor only, the tone should have been very mild as is seen when the ND criticises Bharata or Abhinava (Vide ND, pp. 28, 193). So the real victim appears to be Mammaṭa who is also criticized for considering Nirveda as the Sthāyī of Śānta.

Following the KP, the KS has given the description of Hayagrīva[1] in the Hayagrīvavadha as the illustration of a Rasadoṣa, viz, over-elaboration of a subordinate object[2]. The ND boldly points out that this is not the aforesaid fault. It is the fault of the story or plot, there being less description of the hero of the plot.

The ND mentions and criticizes the view of some who hold that Vyabhicārins, Sthāyins and Rasas should (always be suggested and) never be expressed. This view is found in the KS where it considers the above matter as a Rasadoṣa[3], although it is stated that at times Vyabhicārikathana may not be a Doṣa But the ND holds that this is quite wrong. On the contrary, the actual mention of Vyabhicārins and others may go to develop the particular Vibhāva or situation[4].

The ND refers to another view, viz., mentioning of Vibhāvas or Anubhāvas which are common to two sentiments with the result that the particular Vibhāva is not clearly understandable. The ND gives the illustration where a similar situation arises. This view together with the illustration is found as the first among eight Rasadoṣas mentioned by the KS[5]. The ND states that this is no Rasadoṣa at all. It is simply Vakyadoṣa, fault of expression, as it lacks perpicuity and causes doubt regarding the Bhāva or the sentiment which is to be conveyed[6].

The above-mentioned instances make it absolutely clear that the authors of the ND are men of independent thinking and hold views different from those of their teacher. They have courage enough to state them boldly and criticize the views which are contrary to their own, even if they be the views of the reputed authority like Abhinava or the most revered person as their own teacher.

A question may also arise in the mind of a reader as to why Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra undertook to write on dramaturgy when their preceptor had already treated of the subject in his KS. The pupils were most probably not impelled by a desire to surpass their preceptor. It is reasonable to believe that in view of the brief treatment of dramaturgy in

1. KS, p 171; ND, p. 174.
2. It should be noted here that this illustration and the views that follow are borrowed by the KS from the KP.
3. Rasasthāyivyabhicāriṇaṁ svaśabdena vācyatvaṁ doṣah — KS, p. 159.
4. Kecit tu vyabhicārirasasthāyināṁ svaśabdena vācyatvaṁ rasadoṣaṁ āhus tad 'ayuktaṁ, vyabhicāryādīnāṁ svavācakapadaprayoge 'pi vibhāvapuṣṭau. —ND, p. 175.
5. Tatra vibhāvānubhāvayoḥ kleśavyaktir yathā pariharati ratiṁ matiṁ lunīte skhalatitarām ... etc. — KS, p. 169.
6. Evam ubhayarasasādhāraṇavibhāvapadānām kaṣṭena niyatavibhāvābhidhāyitvādhigamo 'pi sandigdhatvalakṣaṇo vākyadoṣa eva. — ND, p. 176.

the KS, they undertook composing the ND. If we have a look at the nature and scope of the KS we find that the work has a very wide field to cover. It deals with Kāvya i. e. literature in all its forms and aspects. The field of poetics is too vast to allow an exhaustive treatment of dramaturgy in one and the same work. That is exactly why most of the Sanskrit poeticians like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Mammaṭa and others have not touched the subject of dramaturgy in their works on poetics and we find separate works such as the DR, the NLR, the ND and others on the subject of dramaturgy alone The KS does treat of dramaturgy but its treatment is too brief and unsatisfactory. The subject is dealt with in the last chapter and is disposed of in a few pages. Most of the Rūpakas are disposed of in three to four verses. Even Nāṭaka is not devoted more verses than two. Here too the KS has simply copied out verbatim from the NS of Bharata and the Abhi Thus the treatment does not betray any originality and hardly deserves much credit The pupils (Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra) must have thought, therefore, of giving a fuller, detailed and systematic treatment to this very important and well developed form of Sanskrit literature. The authors of the ND, even though they must have been influenced by the KS, have treated the subject in an independent manner and have fully succeeded in giving a clear and lucid exposition to this very important aspect of literary criticism.

One point needs to be stressed here again. The above comparison of the works where we have been able to perceive considerable similarity and sometimes verbal identity need not lead us to conclude that the ND has extensively borrowed from the KS. The fact is that even though the KS and the ND are similar at places, the views that the KS has expressed are also to be found in earlier works such as the Abhi., the Dhv., the KP, etc. from which the KS has amply borrowed. So the ND might have borrowed directly from the KS or from the earlier original sources from which the KS has borrowed, e. g. some of the views (of the KS) which are criticized by the ND are originally the views of Mammaṭa. Still it is quite natural to presume that Hemacandra being the preceptor of our authors, they must have studied well his KS and other works. They actually quote from Hemacandra's Śabdānuśāsana. The KS, therefore, must have some influence at least on their writing, which is clearly seen in their benedictory verse and at other places as we have already discussed, despite the fact that our authors accept only those of Hemacandra's views which could satisfy their own reason. Moreover the KS set model for an assimilative type of work for the authors of the ND.

(v) *The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*

The SP of Bhoja is a voluminous work dealing with poetics including dramaturgy. A comparative study of the two works, viz., the SP and the ND, indicates that the ND has considerably drawn upon the SP.

Firstly, the authors of the ND have accepted the same types of Uparūpakas as have been mentioned by the SP having added Saṭṭaka to the list of the SP. The ND verbally borrows the definition of Saṭṭaka and the other Uparūpakas from the SP. Even the same order is also resorted to with very minor changes.

The Durmallikā of the SP is called the Durmilitā by the ND.

The ND has at times referred to the view of Bhoja under the usual "Kecit" or "Anye". The following may be quoted as instances :

नाट्यदर्पण	शृङ्गारप्रकाश
१. अन्ये तु संहतानां प्रतिपक्षाणां विश्लेषकं भेदरूपमुपायं भेदनं मन्यते । — पृ० ६५	१. सङ्घातरूपभेदी यस्स भेदः । — पृ० २०८
२. अन्ये तु चित्रार्थं रूपकं वचः इति पठन्ति। — पृ० ८४	२. चित्रार्थसमवाये तु रूपमुच्यते । — पृ० २१५
३. कपटस्यान्यथाभावमन्ये अधिबलमाहुः । — पृ० ८९	३. कपटस्यान्यथाभावं ब्रुवतेऽधिबलं बुधाः । — पृ० २१८
४. केचिदप्रस्तुतार्थवचने प्रसङ्गमिच्छन्ति । — पृ० ९३	४. अप्रस्तुतार्थवचनं प्रसङ्गः परिकीर्तितः । — पृ० २२२-२३
५. अपरे तु तर्जनाधर्षणे द्युतिं मन्यन्ते । — पृ० ९६	५. वाक्यं आधर्षसंयुक्तं द्युतिस्तज्ज्ञैरुदाहृता । — पृ० २२३
६. अपरे तु क्रोधादेः प्राप्तस्य शमनं द्युतिमामनन्ति । — पृ० १०८	६. ईर्ष्याकोपप्रशमनं द्युतिमाचक्षते बुधाः । — पृ० २२९
७. अन्ये तु वर्तमानप्रत्यक्षार्थवाचकं हास्यलेशकरं वचो व्याहारमिच्छन्ति । — पृ० १३५	७. प्रत्यक्षवृत्तिरुक्तो व्याहारो हास्यलेशः । — पृ० १४७
८. केचित्तु पात्रान्तरे स्वव्यापारं निक्षिप्य यत्कार्यान्तरकरणं तदवलगितमित्याहुः । — पृ० १४९	८. यत्राऽन्यस्मिन् समावेश्य कार्यमन्यत् प्रसाध्यते। तच्चावलगितं नाम विज्ञेयं नाट्यवेदिभिः ॥ — पृ० १८५

In most of the above-quoted instances the illustrations quoted by both are the same. In the following cases also the same illustrations are found in the ND and the SP, e. g.,

(1) The illustration of Patākāsthānaka from the Rāmābhyudaya (Act III-SP, Act II-ND) where Sugrīva sends a message to Sītā- 'Why

to talk more ? O respectable one! Rāma will bring you back in no time even if you be on the other side of the ocean'.

ND, p. 45; SP, p. 201.

(ii) The illustration of Patākāsthānaka from the MDR where Cāṇakya speaks to himself, "O, if that wretched Rākṣasa were caught", and immediately Siddhārthaka enters with the words, "Sir,............has been caught." ND, p. 46; SP, pp. 201-2.

(iii) The illustration of Upakṣepa from the RTN, viz., "Propitious fate brings at once the desired object, even from a different isle........" etc... (I, 6). ND, p. 60; SP, p. 204.

(iv) The illustration of Narma from the RTN, consisting of a humorous dialogue between the king and the Vidūṣaka.

ND, p. 74; SP, pp. 211-12.

(v) The illustration of Pariṇyāsa from the Veṇī. I, 21 where Bhīma takes an oath to braid Draupadī's hair having killed Duryodhana.

ND, p. 61; SP, p. 204.

(vi) The illustration of Ānanda from the RTN, viz., King - Who would not honour the favour by the queen ?

ND, p. 109; SP, p. 230.

(vii) The illustration of Vākkelī. The witty dialogue between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa where Rādhā asks who it was at the door. Kṛṣṇa replies that it was Hari [(i) Kṛṣṇa (ii) Monkey, whereupon Rādhā wittily inquires what business the monkey had there, etc. ND, p. 145; SP, p. 189.

(viii) The illustration of Trigata from the Indulekhā Vīthī -

"Is it the cooing of the royal swans ? or is it the humming of the bee ?"......etc. ND, p. 143; SP, p. 188.

Thus it is very clear that the authors of the ND are considerably indebted to Bhoja and that they have often mentioned his views under 'Anye', 'Kecit', 'Yad āhuḥ', etc. The SP is mainly a work on poetics; however the subject of dramaturgy does find a place in it and our authors have made considerable use of it.

The ND can be very useful in another way. The text of the SP as found in the manuscript is highly corrupt and incomplete as it drops many lines or words in between. The ND, because it draws upon the (SP), can help in settling the text[1], e. g. the text regarding the definition of Prapañca (SP p. 191) is highly corrupt. But the illustration quoted by the ND from the Prayogābhyudaya to illustrate the view of 'some'

1. This point has been discussed in the comparative study between the ND and the Abhi.

is identical with that given by the SP. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that the view of some here refers to the view of Bhoja especially when we have seen that his view is so often referred to and his definitions verbally quoted by the ND. Thus in the light of the ND we can supply some of the missing portion of the text.

(vi) *The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*[1]

The NLR of Sāgaranandin is a work treating on dramaturgy. As the work is believed to have preceded the ND and as the authors of the ND claim to have studied the previous works on the subject it is quite natural that they should have consulted Sāgaranandin also on certain occasions.

The following are the instances where the view of the NLR is mentioned by the authors of the ND -

नाट्यदर्पण	नाटकलक्षणरत्नकोश
१. एके तु वर्णितार्थतिरस्कारं वर्णसंहारमामनन्ति। — पृ० ७३	१. वर्णितार्थस्य तिरस्कारो वर्णसंहारः । — पृ० ३०
२. कपटस्यान्यथाभावमन्ये अधिबलमाहुः । — पृ० ८९	२. कपटस्यान्यथाकरणमधिबलम् । — पृ० ३२
३. केचिदप्रस्तुतार्थवचनं प्रसङ्गमिच्छन्ति । — पृ० ९३	३. अप्रस्तुतार्थख्यापन प्रसङ्गः । — पृ० ३५
४. अन्ये तु भविष्यदर्थतत्त्वोपलब्धि क्रममिच्छन्ति । — पृ० ८६	४. भविष्यत्तत्त्वोपलब्धिः क्रमः । — पृ० ३२
५. अन्ये तु संहतानां प्रतिपक्षाणां बीजफलोत्पत्तिनिरोधकानां विश्लेषक भेदरूपमुपाय भेदकं मन्वते । — पृ० ६५	५. सङ्घातेन मिलितस्यार्थस्य भङ्गो भेदः । — पृ० २७
६. अन्ये तु वर्तमानप्रत्यक्षार्थवाचकं हास्यक्लेशकरं वचो व्याहारमिच्छन्ति । — पृ० १३५	६ प्रत्यक्षानुभवारूढो व्याहारो हास्यक्लेशकृत् । — पृ० १२४
७. केचित्तु पात्रान्तरे स्वव्यापार निक्षिप्य यत्तु कार्यान्तरकरण तदवलगितम् । — पृ० १४९	७ यत्राऽन्यस्मिन् समावेश्य कार्यमन्यत् प्रकाश्यते । तच्चावलगितम् ... ॥ — पृ० १२२

1. This comparative study has been undertaken on the consideration that the NLR precedes the ND on the basis of the dates given by Prof. Godo and M. R. Kavi who have been followed by P. V. Kane and M. Ghosh respectively. Dr. V. Raghavan puts the work after Bhoja and Abhinava and before Śāradātanaya and in no case later than the thirteenth century. He, however, does not specify whether it preceded the ND or not.

8. Definition of Kṛti.

The ND refers to a view of some who do not recognize Kṛti and accept Dyuti instead which is defined as 'pacification of unfavourable things' (p. 167). The NLR too mentions Dyuti in stead of Kṛti, which is defined as 'pacification of jealousy and misery' (p. 37).

9. While discussing Pūrvabhāva, a limb of Nirvahaṇa Saṁdhi, the ND points to a view of some who accept Pūrvavākya instead and define it as a sentence similar to that in Mukha Saṁdhi. The NLR reads Pūrvavākya instead of Pūrvabhāva and defines it as "exposition of the seed"[1] (which is sown in Mukha Saṁdhi) which agrees in sense with the definition given above by the ND (ND, p. 111).

By an examination of the aforesaid cases we can infer that even though the NLR did not have any notable influence on the writers of the ND, the latter did consult the work occasionally. Usually the authors of the ND, when they refer to the views of others, state them keeping the same wording as is evident from the numerous quotations which the ND has cited from the DR. The difference in wording here may be explained in three ways :-

1. The readings of the text often differ in different manuscripts, so the text of the NLR which was before the ND might have slightly different readings.

2. The authors of the ND might not have the actual text of the NLR by their side when they wrote the work (as they had the Abhi., the DR and the NS with them) but they must have studied or gone through the text of the NLR beforehand and they are quoting from memory.

3. The citations originally refer to some other work on dramaturgy which was fairly utilized by the NLR. This alternative explanation gets corroborated by the fact that the illustrations which are quoted by the ND to illustrate the views do not tally with those in the NLR (so far as the above-mentioned instances are concerned).

Dr. V. Raghavan rightly opines that the NLR has mainly drawn upon Bhoja and Abhinavagupta. A comparative study of the ND and the SP suggests that most of the above-mentioned views which are referred to by the ND are also traceable to the SP of Bhoja. So it is quite probable that the ND is referring to Bhoja, the original authority, upon whom both draw.

1. NLR, p. 38.

So far as illustrations from the dramatic works are concerned the ND and the NLR have about a dozen of illustrations common to both. But here too, excepting two or three, illustrations quoted by the ND are in a context quite different from that of the NLR, e. g.,

(a) "Ātāmratāṁ apanayāmi..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 89) to illustrate Adhibala while by the NLR (p. 68) to illustrate a Lakṣaṇa called Anunaya.

(b) "Anyonyāsphālabhınna......" etc. is given as an illustration of Bhedana by the ND (p. 64) while the NLR quotes it to illustrate Samādhāna (p. 26).

(c) The ND (p. 102) quotes "Pūryantāṁ..." etc. to illustrate Prarocanā while the NLR (p. 4) to illustrate Avamarśa.

(d) "Bhartā tavāhaṁ" etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 102) to illustrate Yukti while by the NLR (p. 127) to illustrate Tarka.

(e) "Bhūyaḥ paribhavakṣānti..." etc. is cited by the ND (p. 62) to illustrate Udbheda, by the NLR (p. 26) to illustrate Vidhāna.

(f) "Manaḥ prakṛtyaiva calaṁ..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 85) to illustrate Udāhṛti, by the NLR (p. 31) to illustrate Rūpa.

(g) "Satpakṣā madhuragiraḥ..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 150) to illustrate Avaspandita, by the NLR (p. 7) to illustrate Bīja (Śleṣa variety).

(h) "Svargastrī yadi..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 48) to illustrate Paribhāvanā, while the NLR (p. 64) takes it as an illustration of Saṁśaya.

(i) "Tavāsmi gītarāgeṇa..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 154) to illustrate one of the modes of the entry of a character by Āhvāna (i. e. calling), the NLR (p. 51) cites it as an instance of Avalagita type of Prastāvanā.

(j) "Tīrṇe bhīṣmamahodadhau.." etc. is cited by the ND (p. 58) to illustrate a variety of Avamarśa in which impediment is based on fury. The NLR (p. 34) illustrates by the same verse another variety of Avamarśa where the obstruction is of the nature of a calamity (Vyasana).

The instances given above clearly suggest that the commonness of the verses which is found in the two works is simply accidental and does not show the influence of one on the other.

The illustrations which find a place in both the ND and the NLR in the same context are as under :-

1. "Cañcadbhujabhramita..." etc. is quoted by both the ND (p. 61) and NLR (p. 25) as an illustration of Parinyāsa but this need not lead us to suppose that the ND has borrowed from the NLR since the Abhi. (III, p. 38) also quotes the same verse to illustrate Parinyāsa.

2. "Mathnāmi kauravaśataṁ..." etc. is quoted by the ND (p. 66) and the NLR (p. 26) as an illustration of Prāpti or Prāpaṇa. This verse is cited also by the DR to illustrate Prāpti (and does not show the influence of the NLR).

3. The ND (p. 86) gives a view of "some" who define Krama as "the understanding of the future event", and illustrates from the Veṇī.

Kṛpa - "O king Duryodhana! The son of Droṇa has decided to bear the heavy burden of war." etc.

The same illustration along with the view is found in the NLR (p. 52).

The instances quoted above suggest that the authors of the ND do not seem to have reckoned the NLR as an authority. Some of the illustrations of the ND which show similarity with those of the NLR (and whose number is far less than the number of those which are dissimilar) seems to be accidental rather than intentional. Nevertheless it is quite probable that on certain occasions the authors of the ND did refer to the view of the NLR.

B. *Traces of the influence of other works*

The ND reveals slight traces of influence of a few works on poetics, viz., the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, the Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa, the Kāvyālaṁkāra of Bhāmaha and the Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin.

In fact the writers on poetics, with only a few exceptions, have usually ignored the subject of dramaturgy for the fear of their work being lengthy[1]. Still however it is possible to find some similarity between the ND and the above-mentioned works, especially the Dhv. and the KP on matters concerning both the poetics as well as the dramaturgy such as sentiment (Rasa), flaws of sentiments, contradictory sentiments, states (Bhāva) etc.

(a) *The Nāṭyadarpaṇa and the Dhvanyāloka*

In the history of Sanskrit poetics the Dhv. is considered to be an epoch-making work. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra seem to have been indebted to Ānandavardhana in giving an exposition of Rasadoṣas which a poet as well as a dramatist should scrupulously avoid. Ānandavardhana

1. Cf. Bhāmaha - Uktaṁ tad abhineyārthaṁ ukto 'nyais tasya vistaraḥ - 1.24; also, Daṇḍin - Miśrāṇi nāṭakādīni teṣāṁ anyatra vistaraḥ - I,31.

gives such a very lucid and critical exposition of this topic that the later writers like Mammaṭa and Hemacandra have amply drawn upon the Dhv. Thus there is a similarity of treatment among all these three works so far as this topic is concerned and so it is difficult to say which of the works the ND has actually drawn upon.

The types of Doṣas discussed by the ND are in keeping with the Dhv. The following parallelism is clearly perceptible. The following Doṣas should be avoided :-

(1) Introduction of unfavourable Vibhāvas.
ND, p. 173; Dhv., p. 290.

(2) A sudden statement not relevant to the subject in hand.
ND, p. 174; Dhv., p. 289.

(3) Depiction of characters in a contrary way (not in keeping with their nature).
ND, p. 174; Dhv., p. 293.

(4) Over-elaboration of a subordinate element.
ND, p. 174; Dhv., p. 291.

(5) Unnecessary elaboration of a sentiment that is fully developed (e, g. the sentiment of pathos in the lamentations of Rati in the Kumārasaṁbhava).
ND, p. 175; Dhv., p. 293.

The influence of the Dhv. is also seen in the ND's views on Aucitya. In the history of Aucitya Ānandavardhana has a very important place. He reckons Aucitya as the very secret of Rasa. The greatest flaw in Rasa is lack of propriety[1]. The ND too, following the Dhv., recognizes Anaucitya as the first and the foremost among the flaws of Rasa and all the rest are included in it[2]. The ND, like Ānandavardhana, takes the idea of Aucitya as pervading the entire field of literature[3]. The ND has also quoted a verse from the Dhv. to the effect that Sandhis and Sandyaṅgas are to be employed with a view to developing Rasa and not merely to fulfil the conditions of Śāstra[4].

The problem of contradictory Rasas discussed by the ND also seems to be based on the Dhv.

1. Anaucityād ṛte nānyad rasabhaṅgasya kāraṇaṁ; Prasiddhaucityabandhas tu rasasyopaniṣat parā.— Dhv. p. 259.
2. Aṅgaugryādayaś ca doṣāḥ paramārthato 'naucityāntaḥpātinaḥ – ND, p. 175.
3. For detail vide Appendix—D.
4. ND, p. 70; Dhv. III, 12.

नाट्यदर्पण	ध्वन्यालोक
१. एकस्मिन्नाश्रये ... परस्परविरुद्धयो रसयोर्विरुद्धता, न तु भिन्ने। पृ. १७२	१ विरुद्धैकाश्रयो यस्तु विरोधी स्थायिनो भवेत्। स विभिन्नाश्रयः कार्यस्तस्य पोषेऽप्यदोषता॥ पृ. ३२१
२ तथा स्वैरिणोः स्वतन्त्रयोः ... रसयोर्विरुद्धता, न तु ... मुख्यस्यायत्तयोर्वा। ... मुख्यस्यायत्तौ यथा–'क्षिप्तो हस्तावलग्नः...(इत्यादि)'। पृ. १७२	२. इयं चाङ्गभावप्राप्तिरन्या यद् ... प्रधान एकस्मिन्वाक्यार्थे रसयोर्भावयोर्वा परस्परविरोधिनोर्द्वयोरङ्गभावगमनं तस्यामपि न दोषः। यथोक्तं 'क्षिप्तो हस्तावलग्नः' इत्यादौ। पृ. ३०४
३. तथैकाश्रययोरपि तुल्यबलयोर्विरोधो न तु हीनाधिकबलयोः यथा – पुरूरवाः प्राह – क्वाकार्यं शशलक्ष्मणः ... (इत्यादि)। पृ. १७३	३. यस्तु लब्धप्रतिष्ठे तु विवक्षिते रसे विरोधिरसाङ्गानां बाध्यत्वेनोक्तावदोषः। यथा — क्वाकार्यं शशलक्ष्मणः ... (इत्यादि)। पृ. ३०१
४ तथैकाश्रययोः स्वैरिणोस्तुल्यशक्त्योर्विरुद्धयोर्योगे नैरन्तर्ये विरोधो न त्वविरुद्धेन रसान्तरेण व्यवधाने। यथा — नागानन्दे ...। पृ. १७३	४. एकाश्रयत्वे निर्दोषो नैरन्तर्ये विरोधवान्। रसान्तरव्यवधिना रसो व्यङ्ग्यः सुमेधसा॥ ... यथा शान्तशृङ्गारौ नागानन्दे निवेशितौ। पृ. ३२३
५. अयं स रशनोत्कर्षी ...॥ अत्र भूरिश्रवसः समरभुवि पतितबाहुदर्शनेन तत्प्रियाणां शृङ्गारः स्मर्यमाणः करुण पोषयति। पृ. १७२	५ यतः ... प्रागवस्थाभाविभिः संस्मर्यमाणैर्विलासैरधिकतरं शोकावेशमुपजनयन्ति। यथा -- अयं स रशनोत्कर्षी ...॥ पृ. ३१०

Thus in spite of the apparently different natures of the two works, the authors of the ND seems to have studied well this masterly composition of Ānandavardhana and depended upon him so far as the treatment of the aforesaid aspects of Rasa are concerned.

(b) *The Nāṭyadarpana and the Kāvyaprakāśa*

Mammaṭa is one of the most popular Sanskrit rhetoricians. His KP is reckoned to be one of the most authentic works on Sanskrit poetics and has won very wide popularity. The authors of the ND too seem to have studied well his work, as an acquintance with it is casually noticeable in their own work.[1]

नाट्यदर्पण	काव्यप्रकाश
१ अथ शिष्टसमयपरिपालनाय प्रत्यूहव्यूहोपशमनाय च ... समुचितेष्टाभिदेवतस्य सूत्रकारौ नमस्कारश्लोकं परामृशतः पृ. १४	१ ग्रंथारम्भे विघ्नविघाताय समुचितेष्टदेवतां ग्रंथकृत् परामृशति। पृ. १
२ ..... रामवद्वर्तितव्यं न रावणवदिति ......। पृ. २५	२ ... रामादिवद्वर्तितव्यं न रावणादिवदिति ...। पृ. १०

There is a remarkable similarity between the KP and the ND in the treatment of flaws of Rasa and how to reconcile the use of contradictory Rasas simultaneously[1]. The original source for both the works is evidently the Dhvanyāloka. Still however it is clear that the ND has fully consulted the KP[2] on the subject as can very well be inferred from the criticism of the views of the KP wherever our authors have differed as well as the specific reference to Mammaṭa by name while discussing the topics mentioned above (concerning Rasa).

Some illustrations too appear to be common to both :-

1. Anyatra vrajatīti......etc.
   ND p. 165. KP p. 103.
2. Ekasmin śayane ......etc.
   ND p. 164 KP p. 125.
3. Dantakṣatāni ......etc.
   ND p 174. KP p. 455.
4. Ayaṁ sa raśānotkarśī..etc.
   ND p. 172. KP p. 453.
5. Kṣipto hastāvalagnaḥ..etc.
   ND p. 172. KP p. 457.
6. Kvākāryaṁ ....etc.
   ND p. 173. KP p. 447.

At one place our authors plainly and specifically criticize Mammaṭa for calling Nirveda as the Sthāyī of Śānta. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra point out that Mammaṭa has committed an error of self-contradiction when he considers Nirveda at one place as a Sthāyī while at another as a Vyabhicārī[3].

The ND often disagress with the views of the KP and criticizes them, e. g.,

(1) The ND does not consider the description of Hayagrīva which Mammaṭa takes as a Rasadoṣa, viz., over--elaboration of a minor thing[4], as a fault of Rasa but a fault of story[5].

1. ND, pp. 171-176.
   KP, pp. 433-460.
2. Even Hemacandra, the learned preceptor of our authors, has profusely drawn upon the KP.
3. This view has been discussed in Ch. III of the present work (pp. 166-7).
4. Aṅgasyāpradhanasyātivistareṇa varṇanaṁ yathā hayagrīvavadhe hayagrīvasya - KP, p. 441.
5. Kecid atra hayagrīvavadhe hayagrīvavarṇanaṁ udāharanti. Sa punar vṛttadoṣo, vṛttanāyakasyālpavarṇanāt. - ND, p. 174.

(2) The ND does not agree with Mammaṭa when he says that Vyabhicārīs etc. should not be mentioned by name[1].

(3) The KP refers to a Rasadoṣa where Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas common to two sentiments are referred. The ND opines that it is a Vākyadoṣa and not a Rasadoṣa. The ND quotes the same verse viz., 'Pariharati ratiṁ, matiṁ, lunīte'..etc. (which Mammaṭa quotes as a Rasadoṣa where the Vibhāva is not clearly grasped on account of the ambiguity of the Anubhāvas)[2] and remarks that it is a Vākyadoṣa[3].

It can be very conveniently inferred from the above data that Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra were fully conversant with the KP of Mammaṭa and occasionally consulted it especially with regard to certain problems connected with Rasa.

(c)

नाट्यदर्पण		काव्यालङ्कार	
१. प्राणाः कवित्वं विद्यानां लावण्यमिव योषिताम् । त्रैविद्यवेदिनोऽप्यस्मै ततो नित्यं कृतस्पृहाः ।।	पृ. २३	१. अधनस्येव दातृत्वं क्लीबस्येवास्त्रकौशलम् । अज्ञस्येव प्रगल्भत्व अकवेः शास्त्रवेदनम् ।।	पृ. १
२ नासिकान्ते द्वयं श्चित्रं द्रुवोर्भीडा रसज्ञयोः । कुचाभावः कुरङ्गाक्ष्याः काव्याभावो विपश्चितः ।।	पृ. २४	२. रहिता सत्कवित्वेन कीदृशी वाग्विदग्धता ।	पृ. १
३. अकवित्वं परस्तावत् कलङ्कः पाठशालिनाम् । अन्यकाव्यैः कवित्वं तु कलङ्कस्यापि चूलिका ।।	पृ २४	३ अ(ना)कवित्वमधर्माय व्याधये दण्डनाय च । कुकवित्वं पुनः साक्षान्- मृतिमाहुर्मनीषिणः ।।	पृ. २
४ अर्थशब्दवपुः काव्यम् ।	पृ १४०	४. शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यम् ।	पृ. २

(d)

नाट्यदर्पण		काव्यादर्श	
१. नासिकान्ते द्वयं श्वित्रं...... काव्याभावो विपश्चितः ।।	पृ २४	१. स्याद्वपुः सुन्दरमपि श्वित्रेणैकेन दुर्भगम् ।।	१, ७
२. अर्थशब्दवपुः काव्यम्	३, १२३	२ शरीरं तावदिष्टार्थव्यवच्छिन्ना पदावली ।	१, १०

1. Mammaṭa mentions it as the first among Rasadoṣas (KP VII, 60). Cf. ND–Kecit te vyabhicārirasasthāyināṁ svaśabdavācyatvaṁ rasadoṣaṁ āhus tad ayuktam. Vyabhicāryādīnāṁ svavācakapadaprayoge 'pi vibhāvapuṣṭau – (p. 175).
2. KP, p. 438.
3. ND, p. 176.

C. The influence of the ND on later works

In spite of the obvious merits of the ND as an independent work on dramaturgy it appears that the ND could not exercise any notable influence on the later writers on dramaturgy. In fact, the work was totally neglected by the later theorists. We do not come across the name of Rāmacandra and Gunacandra or any mention of their work in the later works on dramaturgy. Their peculiar views on certain topics such as Rasa, Pūrvaraṅga, etc. do not seem to have been taken note of by the later Brahmanical critics like Viśvanātha, Jagannātha and others. It is difficult to say whether it was due to any sectarian prejudices or otherwise.

In the definitions of the Uparūpakas we find a number of verses in the ND to be common with those of the BP. But here both seem to have drawn upon a common source which is most probably the SP of Bhoja[1].

The only later work in which we may find some traces of the influence of the ND is the Kāvyaprakāśakhaṇḍana of Siddhicandragaṇi. The KPK refers to some views which are ascribed to moderners and which, though not identical with those of the ND, are very similar to them, e.g., the moderners partly agree with the ND's view of the dual nature of Rasa in so far as they also believe that Karuṇa and others do not produce joy. They, on the other hand, are not prepared to reckon them as Rasas at all.

The moderners also agree with the ND in differing from Mammaṭa on the point that the verbal mentioning of the Vyabhicāribhāvas etc. is a fault. They, on the other hand, believe that the verbal mentioning is a positive merit and not a demerit[2].

1. It has been already pointed out that the ND has literally borrowed the definitions of all the Uparūpakas from Bhoja and the BP also must have done the same so far as some of the definitions are concerned.
2. KPK, p. 59.

CHAPTER VII

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA AS A WORK ON DRAMATIC SCIENCE

The chapter dealing with the ND's relation to the earlier works on Dramaturgy clearly suggests that Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra are highly indebted to some of the earlier works on dramaturgy such as the NS, the Abhi., the DR and the KS. This is quite natural. Any new writer on a subject must equip himself with the knowledge of the earlier works on the subject. His writing should reveal his familiarity with all the important works before him, in the absence of which the work would lack in comparative excellence, depth of criticism and worthy contribution. Moreover, in a subject like this where the writer is expected to examine the different views dispassionately, weigh them, and arrange them systematically it is all the more necessary for him to go critically through the earlier works and accept what is worth accepting. Again, in a scientific subject where the writer is required to state clearly the facts and figures there is not much scope for a new writer to exhibit his creative or imaginative genius so far as the matter is concerned and consequently there is bound to be a reproduction of the ideas and views presented by the earlier writers.

In fact, after the encyclopaedic work of Bharata, which treats of all the topics concerning drama, there was very little scope for a later writer to add any thing new or substantial apart from some minor additional details. Dhanañjaya in all politeness plainly confesses this fact in the beginning of his work[1]. But this does not mean that after the edition of an authoritative work there is no scope left for the latter writers. Hemacandra brings out this point very ably and emphatically in his Pramāṇamīmāṁsā. At the very outset, while explaining the purpose of his work and answering the narrow-minded critics who doubt the genuineness of a writer's work whose subject-matter has already been dealt with by his predecessors, Hemacandra pointedly asks if there were no Sūtras even before Pāṇini, Piṅgala, Kaṇāda, Akṣapāda and others. It is not true that Pāṇini was the first to compose the aphorisms of grammar, nor was Kaṇāda the first to compose the aphorisms to Indian Logic. There were a number of other writers who had already written on their respective subjects and Pāṇini and others did make full use of

1. Aparaṁ lakṣma kaḥ kartum īṣṭe – DR I, 4.

them. What these writers did was to collect whatever material was already there, arrange it systematically and put it in a new form. Similarly, even in dramaturgy was there nothing written on the subject before Bharata, the highest authority on the science of drama? Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya does refer to Naṭasūtras before Bharata. Bharata himself refers to the previous authorities in the form of 'Atra ślokāḥ', 'Atra Āryā', 'Ānuvaṁśyaślokāḥ', etc. But does anybody argue, continues Hemacandra, on the basis of the same data that the works of Bharata, Pāṇini and others are not original and therefore are useless? He ingeniously remarks that these sciences are without any definite beginning in time but they appear to grow ever new according as they are delivered in abridged or amplified forms and as such are said to be the handiwork of this or that person[1]. Rājaśekhara also in his Kāvyamīmāṁsa categorically states, "There cannot be a poet who is not a thief, there cannot be a merchant who is not a theif; but he alone prospers who knows how to conceal (the theft)[2]."

Even the greatest of our poets and dramatists like Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti had to resort to the earlier works like the Rāmāyaṇa and the MBh. for the plot of their works. As a rule, any piece of literature does betray to some extent the influence of the earlier works which the writer has studied, and still it receives a warm welcome from the learned Sahṛdayas. Thus originality consists not in pure invention but in the final shape which the writer gives to the material he handles[3]. In fact, Śāstra was recognised as a common property and what a new writer on Śāstra had to do was to pour new wine into the old bottle.

Therefore the authors of the ND can easily be pardoned when they draw a few words or a sentence here and there which they would have found to be striking and significant. Still however it becomes apparently astonishing when we find them drawing lines after lines from their predecessors without acknowledging their debt. It indicates that the authors of the ND are not ashamed of copying verbatim when they feel that whatever has been stated earlier is quite alright and needs no rectification. It may however be pointed out that this type of plagiarism is not unique. Most of the later writers on Poetics and Dramaturgy unhesitatingly borrow from their predecessors. The authors of the ND, therefore, need not be blamed on this account.

---

1. Pramāṇamīmāṁsā, p. 1.
2. Nāstyacauraḥ kavijanaḥ nāstyacauro vaṇigjanaḥ;
   Sa nandati vinā vācyaṁ yo jānāti nigūhituṁ. — KM, p. 61.
3. Cf. Ta eva padavinyāsās ta evārthavibhūtayaḥ;
   Tathāpi kāvyaṁ bhāti navyaṁ grathanakauśalāt.

The fact appears still more natural when we bear in mind that our authors were Jaina monks and the purpose of these monks in writing such works was not to establish some new theory but to gather together what was good in the different works, arrange it into a systematic whole, and make it available to the common people for their benefit and enrichment of knowledge.

Thus we cannot blame the authors of the ND for drawing amply upon the earlier sources. On the contrary, a writer who has not carefully studied the previous authorities is likely to betray his ignorance and lack of erudition.

What the authors of the ND have done therefore is that they have consulted the earlier authorities and placed their views systematically in a simple and clear manner. At the same time it should be pointed out that the authors of the ND have never followed any authority blindly. They have the courage to express their views boldly and explicitly even though they differ from the majority of the learned rhetoricians. The boldness with which they have expounded the theory of the dual nature of Rasa defying almost all the celebrated authorities including even their learned preceptor cannot but be appreciated even though one may not agree with the theory as such. With all their reverence for the ancient authorities on dramaturgy they have not hesitated criticising even the most learned of them whenever the authors of the ND found them to be mistaken. They criticise even Bharata, of course without mentioning him by name[1]. They also criticise Abhinavagupta for deriving the word Nāṭaka from the root 'Naṭ' which, they held, was not correct[2]. They have twice criticised Dhanañjaya for disregarding the old tradition of the Vṛddhas[3].

They criticise Śaṅkuka who does not recognize a low type of hero in Prahasana, Bhāṇa, etc., and at the same time recognizes Viṭa and and others as the hero[4]. They also criticize Mammaṭa on a few occasions[5]. Others apart, they have differed at more places than one even from Hemacandra, their revered teacher, for whom they have very great respect which is evident from the homage they pay to him in the

1. e.g., Bharata's restricton of Bhāratī especially to Karuṇa and Bībhatsa only. This point has been discussed in chapter VI of the present work, p. 250.
2. Vide, ibid., ND & Abhi., p. 263.
3. Vide, ibid., (ND & DR) pp. 270-1.
4. Śaṅkukastvadhamaprakṛter nāyakatvamanicchan... viṭāder nāyakatvaṁ pratipādayan katham upādeyaḥ syāt.-ND, p. 133.
5. Vide-Ch. VI of the present work, pp. 288-9.

concluding verses of the ND. They are proud of calling themselves pupils of Hemacandra but are not prepared to follow him blindly. They have criticised even the views which are held by Hemacandra.[1] This clearly reflects their undaunted spirit of freedom of thought and expression. (Rāmacandra was a lover of freedom. His pride and fearlessness are reflected in his plays and poems. He believed in original creation and not in treading the trodden path. Here, of course, he could not be perfectly original and it is understandable.) They have fully equipped themselves with the knowledge of the most of the works on dramaturgy that were available to them. They weigh the soundness of the earlier theories or views on the balance of reasoning. They test them on the touchstone of pure logic, and if they find them to be untenable they reject them outright.

Thus they are endowed with a critical faculty which is highly essential for a writer on a scientific subject like this. They know what to accept and what not to accept.

The authors of the ND have criticised some of the great dramatists for their flaws[2]. They have criticised Bhavabhūti for employing Kaiśikī abundantly in his Mālatīmādhava even though it is a Prakaraṇa[3]. His Mahāvīracarita also has been criticised for the statement of Rāma, viz., "I am going to untie the Kaṅkaṇa" when the heroic sentiment had been raised to a high pitch[4]. Kālidāsa too has been criticised for the description of the amorous dalliance between Umā and Śaṅkara in his Kumārasaṁbhava[5]. Even his Rativilāpa where there is a lengthy description of Rati's lamentations has not escaped criticism[6]. The ND, following the earlier rhetoricians, criticises the Veṇī. for its love-scene between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī at the time of war[7]. The RTN too has been criticised for Ratnāvalī being lost sight of at the advent of Bābhravya in Act IV.[8]

The authors of the ND hold original views on certain vital topics

1. For detail, vide ibid., pp. 277–8.
2. It is not possible to give any special credit to our authors for this, because in most of the under-mentioned cases they are nor original but have reproduced the criticism of the earlier authorities such as the Dhv., the KP, the Abhi., etc.
3. ND, p. 120.
4. ND, p. 174.
5. ND, p. 174.
6. ND, p. 175.
7. ND, p. 174.
8. ND, p. 173.

such as, the number of Rasas[1], the nature of Rasas, the number of Rūpakas, etc. It has been already pointed out how the view that an actor also may experience Rasa may be called as authors' own view. They do not subscribe to the nineteen limbs of Pūrvaraṅga calling them futile and meant for deceiving the faithful innocent men. The ND does not subscribe to the types of prologue but what Bharata, Dhanañjaya and others consider as types it calls "the ways of introducing the characters". The different subdivisions of Vṛttis also do not seem to have been accepted by the ND.

Style

In the concluding verses the authors evaluate their work in these words :

"The labour that we have put in in composing the work can never be appreciated by the 'literary thieves' who try to acquire fame by borrowing words and ideas that belong to others.

"The Sūtras and the Vṛtti are neither too brief nor too eloborate. The words used are just enough to convey the intended sense. Let the learned themselves judge them.

"Like the three-fold current of the Ganges our writing exhibits our proficiency in the three sciences, viz., Grammar, Logic and Poetics.

"If the learned desire to know the true nature of the Rūpakas they should resort to (lit. hold) this stainless (pure) 'mirror of Nāṭya' "[2].

It is evident that the authors claim that —

(i) The Sūtras and the commentary upon them are neither too elaborate nor too brief. Words that are used are just enough to convey the intended sense.

(ii) The work reveals their proficiency in grammar, logic and poetics.

(iii) They have put in very hard labour in composing the work.

(iv) The work presents a clear and realistic picture of the nature and form of the Rūpakas.

---

1. ND admits of nine principal Rasas and believes that there can be still more such as Laulya, Sneha, Vyasana, Duḥkha, Sukha, etc. (ND, p. 163).
2. Cf. Na sūtravṛttyorādhikyaṁ na hīnatvaṁ na kuṇṭhatā;
   Yāvadarthagiraḥ santi svayaṁ santo vivecatām.
   Śabdalakṣma-pramālakṣma-kāvyalakṣma-kṛtaśramaḥ;
   Vāgvilāsas trimārgo nau pravāha iva jāhnujaḥ.
   Rūpasvarūpaṁ vijñātuṁ yadicchata yathāsthitaṁ;
   Santas tadānīṁ gṛhṇita nirmalaṁ nāṭyadarpaṇam. –ND, pp. 215–16.

Their first claim can very well be said to be justifiable. Our authors firmly believe in propriety (Aucitya)[1] and have tried their best to maintain it throughout by making full use of their power of judgment neither being so brief as to be obscure and incomprehensible nor being so elaborate as to be lengthy and verbose.

Their second claim is also equally justified. Their proficiency in poetics is beyond any shadow of doubt when we look at the masterly way in which the topics are treated. Their claim to the knowledge of grammar is also legitimate[2]. Their knowledge of logic is suggested by their systematic representation, logical reasoning, and clarity of expression. That they were well-versed in logic is evident also from their Dravyālaṁkāra, a work on Jaina Nyāya.

Their next claim includes two things : (i) originality and (ii) labour. As regards their originality we have already discussed how far they are original and how far they are indebted to their predecessors. The foregoing discussion shows that, inspite of the flashes of originality that they show on certain occasions it will not be correct to say that the authors are completely original especially in view of the fact that they have drawn so abundantly on their predecessors although it has been already pointed out that the subject does not admit of much originality. Hence the authors are not perfectly justified in claiming originality.[3] But that they have put in very hard labour in writing the work is quite evident. The great number of dramas (and poems) cited as illustrations and of theorists who have been mentioned directly by name or indirectly under the words 'Kecit', 'Anye', etc. and whose works they appear to have carefully studied, clearly suggests that they have taken sufficient pains to equip themselves with the knowledge of the earlier literature[4].

Thus the above claim is partially justified.

The internal study of the text will undoubtedly convince the reader of the fact that the authors are fairly justified in their final claim. They have fully succeeded in presenting a clear picture of the subject without being too brief or too elaborate. The style is as dignified as the subject itself.

---

1. For the ND's views on Aucitya, vide Appendix D.
2. This point is discussed at length later on.
3. The authors of the ND do not appear to claim perfect originality; What they claim is this : they have not simply reproduced the earlier authorities as some of the writers do but have fully digested and assimilated their views and then presented them in their own words.
4. Also cf. ND, p. 21, verse 2.

The chief characteristics of the ND's style are simplicity of language and lucidity with which the topics are treated. In a work like this which deals with a dry, heavy and scientific subject the language too naturally assumes a similar form. The medium of expressing complex ideas also tends to be complex and the writer at times has to resort to heavy and often clumsy constructions and a beginner cannot grasp the sense without considerable effort on his part. Sometimes a writer indulges in a heavy style to exhibit his pedantry. But it must be pointed out to the credit of our authors that they have been uniformly simple. They do not believe in writing in a pompous, bombastic, and grandiloquent style. The exposition of all topics is as simple and lucid as it could ever be.

In order to make the treatment simpler the authors of the ND refrain from introducing new technical words which demand explanation and are likely to create confusion in the mind of a beginner, unless their knowledge is indispensable. Only such words as Sandhis, Avasthās, Rasa, Bhāva, Vṛtti, etc. which a student of rhetorics must be conversant with, being so commonly used by other writers on dramaturgy, are introduced. While many of the technical terms such as Arthaprakṛti, Arthopakṣepaka, Nāṭyokti, Uparūpaka, etc. seem to be deliberately avoided, as the words themselves demand explanation for their proper understanding. At times, a simpler term is used in place of a technical one. Instead of Ādhikārika Vṛtta the term which is mentioned by the NS as well as the DR – the ND says Mukhya Vṛtta which is extremely simple and the reader is saved the trouble of understanding the word Ādhikārika. Similarly words like Kathodghāta, Pravṛttaka and Prayogātiśaya which are the divisions of Prastāvanā and which are mentioned by most of the writers on dramaturgy beginning from Bharata are scrupulously omitted by describing them as modes of introducing the main scene.

This simplicity is the result of the fact that the authors have very clear notions about what they write. They have fully mastered the subject of dramaturgy having read all available literature on the subject including the actual dramatic compositions. Consequently nowhere do we find any confusion of thought, doubt or ambiguity in the statements.

One of the most pleasant features of the ND is the copious examples that the authors have quoted from a very wide range of Sanskrit works some of which are not extant. The total number of works quoted is over sixty and the aggregate number of illustrations quoted amounts to nearly three hundred. The authors of the ND seem to know it well that

one example is apt to save ten lines of explanation. It is true that our authors have very often depended upon the Abhi. or the DR while quoting the examples, nevertheless on many occasions they have totally discarded the traditional illustrations and have offered different ones, very often from the works of Rāmacandra, one of the authors himself. Here we find the poetic genius combined with the critical faculty.

At places the authors give more illustrations than one in order to elucidate one single point, e. g., while discussing Vajra the ND has offered as many as four illustrations. Here also the first illustration is usually taken from some well-known work while the succeeding one is from Rāmacandra's own work. While discussing especially the limbs of Sandhi and those of Vīthī the ND has quoted a number of illustrations. In this respect it appears to surpass any other work on dramaturgy including the DR.

Another commendable feature of the ND is that it gives very apt and charming analogies in order to corroborate a point. These analogies are so natural and convincing that the writers are perfectly successful in bringing the point home to the reader, e. g., in order to establish that even an actor may also experience Rasa, authors of the ND give a couple of analogies. A harlot, they state, while participating in amorous dalliance with a view to obtaining money may herself experience, at times, supreme delight. A songster too while trying to entertain others may himself be entertained on some occasions. How telling and apt these analogies are ! [1]

Wherever possible the ND explains an abstract idea with concrete examples, e. g., trying to explain the states that we experience in literature which are of general nature the ND illustrates the point by the story of love between Rāma and Sītā. When we see Rāma making love to Sītā we understand Rāma and Sītā as man and woman and not as historical personages or as incarnations of Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī respectively, as in that case it is impossible to be one with their sentiment.

The ND also supplies us casually with epigrammatic generalisations such as 'Śreyāṁsi bahuvighnāni bhavanti.' 'Great men being obstructed by impediments strive harder', 'A mango fruit with no juice even though ripe causes agitation', etc.

These lend poetic charm to this scientific work.

The authors of the ND seem to have a fascination for etymological

1. ND, p. 160.

2. For more instances vide Appendix C.

explanation. Whenever and wherever an etymological explanation is possible they never miss the opportunity. Thus we find that all of the twelve Rūpakas have been etymologically explained. Similarly most of the Vīthyaṅgas, Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis, Sandhis, Abhinaya, Sandhyaṅgas, etc. have been etymologized[1], even though many of the etymologies can easily be traced to one source or the other.

Some of these etymologies appear to be novel and striking, e. g., the etymology of the word 'Vidūṣaka' viz., he particularly (Vi) spoils (Dūṣ) the work such as Sandhi by Vigraha and vice versa, or he makes the hero forget separation (Vismārayati) by entertaining him[2].

The zeal and accuracy regarding etymology is expressly evident from the authors' criticism of Abhinavagupta for deriving the word 'Nāṭaka' from the root 'Naṭ'.

The authors of the ND have similar fondness for grammar. They have studied grammar intensively and have perfect mastery over it[3]. Very often when an etymology of a word is given they explain the grammatical formation of the same. They explain what Pratyaya has been applied, in what sense and under what circumstances. They, at times, even quote the aphorisms of grammar, e.g., some of the Vṛttis and Dhruvās are grammatically explained[4]. Here they seem to have usually followed the grammar of Hemacandra which is evident from the fact that, while explaining the grammatical formation of the word Vācika the the authors have quoted the actual Sūtra from Hemacandra's grammar[5]. Similarly, while explaining the formation of Ārabhaṭī an aphorism is quoted. Thus the authors of the ND are fully justified when they claim that their work indicates their proficiency in grammar, logic and poetics[6]. (Here the authors have put grammar first, which may be significant so as to reveal their high regard and reverence for the science of grammar).

So far as the Kārikās are concerned the authors of the ND have maintained aphoristic brevity. In the Kārikās they do not indulge into scholastic discussions, explanations, elucidations, etc. They record bare

---

1. For a detailed list of all the etymologies in the ND vide Appendix A.
2. ND, p. 199.
3. Rāmacandra's proficiency in grammar is also suggested by his commentary (Haimabṛhadvṛttinyāsa) on the grammar of Hemacandra.
4. Grammatical references in the ND have been dealt with in detail in Appendix B.
5. ND, p. 188.
6. What Vāmanācārya said about Mammaṭa, viz., 'Ayaṁ khalu mammaṭo 'vagatasarvaśāstrahṛdayo 'pi mukhyatayā vaiyākaraṇaḥ' is equally applicable to our authors also.

definitions very precisely and that is why they have succeeded in giving a complete treatment of the subject in only two hundred and seven Anuṣṭubh verses. Every word in a Kārikā has been significantly and deliberately used after careful consideration and so cannot be overlooked. The authors bring out the special significance of particular words in the Kārikās in their commentary[1].

The commentary, on the other hand, is written in the usual style. Here too simplicity is the guiding principle. Nowhere have the authors of the ND made any attempt to exhibit their pedantry by entering into lengthy, elaborate and scholastic discussions which are often found in other works of this type. The commentary is uniformly lucid. Usually the commentators take up every word from the Kārikā and explain it. They take care to bring out the importance of significant words, as we have already seen, at the same time they do not waste time over seemingly unimportant words or simple words which require little explanation.

The treatment of the subject as a whole is highly systematic. Topics are treated in their natural order one by one. The ND takes up only those topics which are vitally connected with the science of drama. If we examine the topics treated by the ND it will not be difficult to see that the writing of the authors is always to the point. There are no digressions or unnecessary discussions. The work is primarily meant to serve as a guide to a budding dramatist and hence only those topics have been included which chiefly concern a dramatist and hence topics like types of theatres, building of theatres, costumes, etc. which are treated at length by the NS of Bharata have been omitted by the ND[2].

Authors of the ND are also logical in their reasoning. Even when it would not be possible for us to agree with the line of thought that they present we cannot but appreciate the arguments that are put forward in support of their view. As for instance, how clearly, systematically and logically like an efficient pleader they have put forward the case of the dual nature of Rasa.

Moreover, the authors never want us to accept any thing blindly. They clearly explain the reasons wherever possible, e. g., a divine being should not figure as a hero in a Nāṭaka or a Prakaraṇa. In fact, this is an ordinance from the earlier authorities like Bharata and has to

1. For instance, cf. the commentary on the first benedictory verse which carries two meanings.

2. In the selection of topics the ND may be said to have followed the DR.

be followed and a writer need not explain why. Still however the authors of the ND try to account for the above rule in a rational manner[1]. They also explain why the Nāṭaka should depict the life of a past king and not the contemporary one[2]. Similarly. the absence of the Garbha and Vimarśa in Vyāyoga is also logically explained[3].

The instances cited above go to prove that our authors do not accept anything blindly nor no they expect others to accept their views blindly. They believe in logical reasoning.

The authors of the ND refrain from indulging into needless divisions and sub-divisions, which is typical of Sanskrit theorists. Some of the divisions are purely academic and have no concrete instances illustrating the particular type. This defect, if at all it is a defect, has been severely criticised by the western scholars[4]. It is creditable to our authors that they do not show any special aptitude for such divisions. As far as possible they have done away with needless divisions and sub-divisions. Thus they do not enter into divisions of Prastāvanā or sub-divisions of each of the four Vṛttis (Kaiśikī, Sātvatī, Ārabhaṭī and Bhāratī). Here they seem to strike a new note in so far as all the theorists have reproduced the divisions and sub-divisions as given by Bharata.

Nevertheless our authors could not afford to keep away completely from such divisions as divisions also have an important place in the treatment of scientific subjects like this which requires an analytical study and thus our authors also give theoretical divisions following the earlier authorities Thus the ND has given four varieties of Nāṭikā and twenty one varieties of Prakaraṇa. But here the ND has simply followed its predecessors. But that the ND is not much interested in such divisions is also clear from the treatment of Āṅgika type of Abhinaya where the different types of movements of limbs are not even mentioned by name but are simply suggested by the word "and others"[5].

---

1. Cf. Devatānāṁ durupapādasyāpyarthasyecchāmātrata eva siddhır iti taccaritam aśakyānuṣṭhānatvāt na martyānāṁ upadeśayogyaṁ......ND, p. 27.
2. Cf. Vartamāne ca netari tatkālaprasiddhibādhayā rasahāniḥ syāt, pūrvamahāpuruṣacariteṣu ca aśraddhānaṁ syāt. — ND, p. 27.
3. ND, p. 123.
4. Cf. A. B. Keith: "It is an essential defect of Indian theory in all its aspects that it tends to divisions which are needless and confusing."-Sanskrit Drama, p. 329.
5. Cf. "There the movement of the head is of thirteen types such as Akaṁpita, Kaṁpita, etc; that of the eye is of thirty six types such as Kānta, Bhayānaka, etc." and so on. ND, pp. 189-90.

The authors of the ND have laid considerable stress on the importance of Rasa in drama. Rasa is the soul of drama and all literature[1]. In the introductory verses they have warned the so-called poets who indulge simply in the play of words and are negligent about Rasa. A poem embellished with the figures of speech but devoid of Rasa does not please the heart like a woman well-ornamented but of ugly form. This suggests that the authors of the ND have truly grasped the finer spirit of literature. Another important principle on which our authors have put equal emphasis is that of Aucitya or Propriety. It is a principle which pervades all the aspects of life as well as literature[2].

After a critical study of the text of the ND it should be clear that the simple, lucid and exhaustive way in which all the relevant topics regarding dramaturgy are discussed, the boldness with which the authors have put forward some of their views, the profuse illustrations quoted from a number of Sanskrit plays (some of which are Rāmacandra's own) clearly show the ND to be a work of considerable merit inspite of its indebtedness to its predecessors

If we compare the ND with other works on dramaturgy we can easily perceive that the ND has an important place among the works on dramaturgy. So far as the ND and the NS are concerned there is no doubt that like all other writers on dramaturgy, the authors of the ND also are highly indebted to this great work. Nevertheless the NS is a sort of encyclopaedia of dramaturgy. It treats of all topics relating to drama. It includes many topics which do not directly concern a dramatist. A dramatist, for instance, is not much concerned with the construction of a theatre, the minute details about the religious ceremony called Pūrvaraṅga, the mythological origin of drama etc. Thus the sphere of of the NS is too vast, as a result of which the treatment of the NS becomes rather diffuse.

Hence a work which is written strictly from the point of view of a playwright was a long-felt need. This need seems to have been first supplied by Dhanañjaya. His attempt was highly appreciated by the dramatists and critics and as a result the DR won very wide popularity. Still the DR had its own limitations. Dhanañjaya in his zest to be brief and pointed led the brevity to such an extent that he often become incomprehensible.

1. ND III, 21.

2. For detail see Appendix D.

With a few exceptions the poeticians usually neglected this subject for the fear of their work being too lengthy and those also who treated it were too brief. Hemacandra, for instance, does treat of dramaturgy in his KS but the treatment is so brief and scanty that our authors were not satisfied with it. In fact, Hemacandra could not afford to give a very detailed treatment in his KS as the work primarily dealt with poetics.

The authors of the ND probably undertook composing their Nāṭyadarpaṇa with a view to supplying the long-felt need and surpassing the Daśarūpaka of Dhanañjaya which even with the help of the commentary Avaloka remains at places unintelligible and also supplementing the chapter on dramaturgy of their preceptor Ācārya Hemacandra.

There can be no two opinions about the fact that our authors have achieved commendable success in their effort. This work was the outcome of deep and extensive study[1] of all the great works on dramaturgy and the actual dramas. "How can those writers", ask the authors of the ND, "who attain reputation simply by transfering the words and ideas which really belong to others on their own name realise the pains which we have undertaken?"[2]

While comparing the ND and the DR it has been made clear how the former surpasses the latter from the point of view of style, treatment, etc. The clarity and simplicity of expression, and abundance of examples give the ND a positive superiority to the latter.

One of the great advantages which the authors of the ND had was that they had before them most of the important works in dramaturgy like the NS, the DR, the Abhi., the SP, etc. They were at liberty to make the fullest use of the learning and pedantry of their predecessors and they have not missed the opportunity to do so. They do not remain satisfied by pointing out their own view only but they mention the views of others under 'Anye', 'Kecit' etc. Thus the work is important also because it combines and preserves in itself the various views that were current in the days of our authors.

The ND is important from another point of view also. The ND has drawn illustrations from more than sixty plays, a majority of which still remains unpublished and several of these are known only by name. Its references to the Devīcandragupta, the Svapnavāsavadatta and others are

1. ND, p. 23.
2. ND, p. 215.

highly significant from the historical point of view. The ND therefore is of considerable service in bringing to light some of the plays which have almost sunk into oblivion. Dr. Raghavan therefore rightly expresses his sense of gratitude and admiration for the work (ND) which contains 'rich wealth of material'[1].

It will not be an exaggeration to state that some of the writers on dramaturgy as well as poetics have saved a number of literary compositions from being utterly lost for good, by citing some portion of them to illustrate certain points[2].

It is rather strange that some of the eminent modern scholars of high repute should have ignored the ND. Dr. Keith in his 'Sanskrit Drama' makes no mention of this work in his list of works dealing with dramaturgy. But this is probably due to the fact that the work was published a few years later than the Sanskrit Drama and so naturally Keith had no knowledge of the work. Dr. P. V. Kane casually refers to this work in the 'Index of authors and works' to 'The History of Sanskrit Poetics'. 'The examples are more profuse than Daśarūpakāvaloka. Dilates upon 12 varieties of Rūpakas and many Uparūpakas...... His references to Devīcandragupta are of great historical value"[3]. But apart from this we get little information about this work. It is difficult to understand how this learned and great authority on poetics should have neglected this work which as we have seen is one of the few important works which treat of dramaturgy alone. Dr. Kane is not perfectly justified when he remarks, "The Sāhityadarpaṇa..forms, together with the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata and the Daśarūpa of Dhanañjaya, a triumvirate in the domain of the Sanskrit Drama" as he ignores here the legitimate claims of the ND. We have already seen by the comparative study how the ND surpasses the DR in several respects. It naturally surpasses the SD in the treatment of dramaturgy as the latter is primarily a work on poetics and not independently a work on dramaturgy, where too it hardly betrays any originality but has mostly drawn upon the DR with Avaloka and the NS[4]. So far as a full and thorough treat-

1. Social Play in Sanskrit, p. 12. Also cf. M. Krishnamachariar, 'It (ND) is valuable in literary history for its quotations from various works of great merit, now lost to us'. – History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, p. 644.

2. For details about the references to other works refer to Appendix E of the present work.

3. H. S. P., p. 401.

4. Cf. Keith – Sanskrit Drama, p. 294; also P. V. Kane – H. S. P., p. 292.

ment in a simple, lucid style with profuse illustrations is concerned the ND appears to surpass either of the two works (DR and SD).

The above discussion will show that the ND is a work of considerable merit inspite of its indebtedness to its predecessors. The graceful simplicity with which all the topics are treated deserves appreciation. The exhaustive and unbiassed treatment of the various topics concerning dramaturgy makes it an important handbook for any budding playwright. The work is free from diffuseness and bewildering vastness that we find in the NS, as well as from the aphoristic brevity of the DR which often renders it unintelligible.

Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra thus deserve congratulations for their valuable literary contribution.

In fact, the Jainas have rendered appreciable service to Sanskrit literature by contributing their best to the different branches of knowledge such as grammar, rhetorics, dramaturgy, vocabulary, metrics, erotics, art, architecture, mathematics, medicine, politics. ethics, religion, etc.[1] Good many works have been written on the subject of poetics, viz., Kāvyānuśāsana of Hemacandra, Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra, Kāvyamīmāṁsā, Alaṁkāramahodadhi, Vāgbhaṭa's Kāvyānuśāsana, Alaṁkāracintāmaṇi, Vakroktiprakāśikā and many others. Jainas have written commentaries also on non-Jaina works on poetics[2]. There must have been some attempts by the Jaina writers on the subject of dramaturgy also when they have written so much on poetics but they are not known still. The first and the foremost Jaina work found uptil now treating entirely and independently of the science of drama is the ND. No independent work on dramaturgy is found later also. Therefore the ND is certainly a unique contribution of the Jaina writers to the subject of dramaturgy.

It is a matter of satisfaction that the ND has started drawing the attention of the modern scholars. Dr. V. Raghavan pays a glorious tribute to Rāmacandra when he states that we are so thankful to him for the

1. For details vide Jaina Saṁskṛta Sāhityano Itihāsa, Part - I. R. W. Frazer believes that Jainas had considerable effect on Dravidian literature of the south. He writes, "It was through the fostering care of the Jainas that the south first seems to have been inspired with new ideals, and its literature enriched with new forms of literature".—Literary History of India, p. 310. Also vide Winternitz M. - A History of Indian Literature, Vol. 2, p. 546.

2. The Jaina monks had a special advantage over others, viz., they had renounced the world and so they were free from the worries of life and consequently could devote their entire life to learning, reading and writing and thereby render yeoman's service to literature.

ND and the wealth of its material[1]. Prof. B. J. Sandesara also praises him as a voluminous writer. Dr. Gupta pays a similar tribute to the courage with which the authors have maintained their views which were opposed to the well-established tradition[2]. Prof. D. R. Mankad has quoted very often the view of these authors while discussing the types of Rūpakas and Uparūpakas in his 'The Types of Sanskrit Drama'.

Most of the modern scholars seem to have been attracted to the ND on account of its peculiar views regarding the nature of Rasa. Prof. K. Sahal has discussed the views of the ND about the unpleasantness of the several Rasas. R. Gupta also praises him for the same.

But the real contribution of the ND lies not only in the glimpses of original thinking that we find here and there but it is the simple, lucid, systematic and comprehensive treatment of all the important and relevent topics concerning dramaturgy which a dramatist must know that gives the work a unique place among all the works dealing with the subject of dramaturgy.

1. The Social Play in Sanskrit, p. 12.

2. Psychological Studies in Rasa, p. 68.

APPENDIX-A

ETYMOLOGICAL EXPLANATIONS IN THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA

१. अङ्कावतारः —
— द्वितीयाङ्कावतारणादङ्कावतारः । — पृ० ४०

२. अधिबलम् —
— अधिकबलसम्बन्धादधिबलम् । — पृ० ११६

३ अनुभावाः —
— अनु लिङ्गनिश्चयात् पश्चाद् भावयन्ति गमयन्ति लिङ्गिनं रसमित्यनुभावाः। — पृ० १६२

४ अपवारितम् —
— अपवार्यते बहूनां प्रच्छाद्यत इत्यपवारितम् । — पृ० ३१

५. अभिसारिका —
— सरन्ती स्वयं तस्य पार्श्वे वा सारयन्ती ... अभिसारिका । — पृ० २०३

६. अवलगितम् —
— अन्यकार्यावलगनादवलगितम् । — पृ० १४९

७ अवस्पन्दितम् —
— चक्षुःस्पन्दनादिवदन्तर्गतसूचनीयसम्भवात् । — पृ० १५०

८ अवहित्था —
— न बहिःस्था चित्तवृत्तिरिति पृषोदरादित्वादवहित्था । — पृ० १८४

९. असत्प्रलापः —
— असतोऽसाधुभूतस्य प्रलपनमसत्प्रलापः । — पृ० १४४

१०. आकाशोक्तिः —
— आकाशे पात्राभावात् शून्ये उक्तिः आकाशोक्तिः । — पृ० ३१

११. आक्षेपिकी —
— प्रस्तुतरसोल्लङ्घनेन रसान्तरोद्भावनमाक्षेपः, तत्प्रयोजना आक्षेपिकी । — पृ० १९४

१२ आङ्गिकः —
— अङ्गानि प्रयोजनं हेतवोऽस्येत्याङ्गिकः । — पृ० १८९

१३ आन्तरी —
— अन्तरं छिद्रं तत्र भवा आन्तरी । — पृ० १९५

१४. आरभटी —
— आरेण प्रतोदकेन तुल्या भटा उद्धताः पुरुषा आरभटास्ते सन्त्यस्यामिति ... आरभटी ।
— पृ० १५८

१५. ईहामृगः —
— ईहा चेष्टा मृगस्येव स्त्रीमात्रार्थात्रेति ईहामृगः । — पृ० १२१

१६. उत्सृष्टिकाङ्कः —
— उत्क्रमणोन्मुखा सृष्टिर्जीवितं यासां ता उत्सृष्टिकाः शोचन्त्यः स्त्रियस्ताभिरङ्कितत्वादुत्सृष्टिकाङ्कः।
— पृ० १३०

१७. उदाहृतिः —
— उत्कर्षाहरणादुदाहृतिः । — पृ० ८५

१८. उद्घात्यम् —
— उद्घाते प्रश्नात्मके साधूद्घात्यम् । — पृ० १४९

१९. काव्यसंहारः —
— काव्यमेव संह्रियत इति काव्यसंहारः । — पृ० ११३

२०. कैशिकी —
— अतिशायिनः केशाः सन्त्यासामिति कैशिकाः स्त्रियः, तत्प्रधानत्वात् तासामियं कैशिकी । — पृ० १५७

२१. क्रमः —
— बुद्धिस्तत्र क्रमते न प्रतिहन्यत इत्यर्थः । — पृ० ८६

२२. गण्डः —
— दुष्टार्थगर्भत्वाद् दुष्टशोणितगर्भगण्ड इव गण्डः । — पृ० १३८

२३. ग्रथनम् —
— ग्रथ्यते सम्बध्यते व्यापारेण मुख्यफलमनेनेति ग्रथनम् । — पृ० १०५

२४. चूलिका —
— सा चूलेव चूलिका रङ्गाभिनेयार्थस्य नेपथ्यपात्रोक्तेः शिखाकल्पत्वात् । — पृ० ३९

२५. जनान्तिकम् —
— ...... जनानामेकस्यैव गोप्यत्वाद् बहूनामन्तिकं श्राव्यतया निकटं जनान्तिकम् । — पृ० ३१

२६. डिमः —
— डिमो डिम्बो विप्लव इत्यर्थः, तद् योगादयं डिमः डिमेः संघातार्थत्वात् । — पृ० १३०

२७ तोटकम् —
— तोटयति भिनत्ति हृदयमिति तोटकम् । — पृ० ९१

२८. द्रवः —
— द्रवति श्लथीभवति हृदयमनयेति द्रवः । — पृ० ८८

२९. नर्मद्युतिः —
— नर्मणो द्योतनं नर्मद्युतिः । — पृ० ७५

३०. नाटकम् —
— नाटयति विचित्रं रञ्जनाप्रवेशेन सभ्यानां हृदयं नर्तयतीति नाटकम् । — पृ० २८

३१. नाटी —
— नाटयति नर्तयति व्युत्पाद्यमनांसीति ... नाटी । — पृ० १२१

३२. नियताप्तिः —
— नियता फलाव्यभिचारिण्याप्तिर्नियताप्तिः । — पृ० ५२

३३. निरोधः —
— निरुद्धवस्तुविषयत्वान्निरोधः । — पृ० १०४

३४. नैष्कामिकी —

— निष्क्रमः तत्प्रयोजना ...... नैष्कामिकी । — पृ० १९४

३५ पताका —

— प्रसिद्धिप्राशस्त्यहेतुत्वात्पताकेव पताका । — पृ० ४३

३६. पताकास्थानकम् —

— उपकारित्वमात्रसाम्यात् पताकास्थानस्य तुल्यं पताकास्थानकम् । — पृ० ४४

३७ परिन्यासः —

— परितः न्यसनं परिन्यासः । — पृ० ६१

३८. पुष्पम् —

— तच्च वाक्यं पुष्पमिव पुष्पम् । केशरचनायाः पुष्पमिव पूर्ववाक्यालङ्कारकारित्वात् ।

— पृ० ७८

३९. प्रकरणी —

— प्रकर्षेण क्रियते कल्प्यते अस्यामर्थ इति प्रकरणी । — पृ० १२२

४०. प्रकरी —

— अन्यस्य मुख्यनायकस्यैव प्रयोजनं..... प्रकर्षेण स्वार्थानपेक्षया करोतीति प्रकरी ।

— पृ० ४६

४१. प्रकाशम् —

— ...... अन्येषामात्मव्यतिरिक्तानामपि श्राव्यं तत् प्रकाशत इति प्रकाशम् ।— पृ० ३१

४२. प्रतिमुखम् —

— मुखस्याभिमुख्येन वर्तत इति प्रतिमुखम् । — पृ० ५५

४३ प्रयत्नः —

— प्रकर्षेण यत्नः प्रयत्नः । — पृ० ५०

४४. प्रवेशकः —

— अप्रत्यक्षानर्थान् सामाजिकहृदये प्रवेशयतीति प्रवेशकः । — पृ० ३९

४५. प्राप्त्याशा —

— प्राप्तेः प्रधानफललाभस्याशा प्राप्त्याशा । — पृ० ५१

४६. प्रावेशिकी —

प्रवेशः प्रयोजनमस्या इति... प्रावेशिकी । — पृ० १९३

४७. प्रासादिकी —

— प्रसादप्रयोजना प्रासादिकी । — पृ० १९४

४८. बिन्दुः —

— सर्वव्यापित्वाद् वा जले तैलबिन्दुरिव बिन्दुः । — पृ० ३८

४९. बीजम् —

— ...... स धान्यबीजवद् बीजम् । — पृ० ४०

५०. भाणः —

— भण्यते ...... स्वपरवृत्तं प्रकाशयतेऽनेनेति भाणः । — पृ० १२७

५१. भावः —

— उपचयं प्राप्य रसरूपेण रत्यादिर्भवतीति भावः । — पृ० १५८

५२. मुखम् —

— प्रारम्भावस्थाभावित्वात् प्रधानवृत्तस्य भागो मुखमिव मुखम् । — पृ० ५४

५३. रसः —

— ...... रस्यते आस्वाद्यत इति रसः । — पृ. १५९

५४. वाचिकः —

— वागनुकार्या प्रयोजनं हेतुरस्येति ... वाचिकः । — पृ० १८८

५५. विटः —

— एकं ...... वेत्तीत्येकविद् विटः । — पृ० १९९

५६. विदूषकः —

— सन्धि विग्रहेण विग्रहं सन्धिना च विशेषेण दूषयन्ति नाशयन्ति विप्रलम्भं तु विनोददानेन विस्मारयन्तीति विदूषकाः । — पृ० १९९

५७. विभावः —

— स्थायिनं रसत्वेन भवन्तं विभावयन्त्याविर्भावनाविशेषेण प्रयोजयन्तीति ... विभावाः ।
— पृ० १६२

५८ वीथी —

— वक्रोक्तिमार्गेण गमनाद् वीथीव वीथी । — पृ० १३२

५९. व्यभिचारिणः —

— रसोन्मुखं स्थायिनं प्रति विशिष्टेनाभिमुख्येन चरन्ति वर्तन्त इति व्यभिचारिणः । ...... यद् वा व्यभिचरन्ति स्थायिनि सत्यपि केऽपि कदापि न भवन्तीति व्यभिचारिणः ।
— पृ० १६२

६०. व्यायोगः —

— विशेषेण आ समन्तात् युज्यन्ते कार्यार्थं संरभन्तेऽत्रेति व्यायोगः । — पृ० १२३

६१. व्याहारः —

— विविधोऽर्थ आह्रियतेऽनयेति व्याहारः । — पृ० १३३

६२. सन्धिः —

— मुख्यस्य ... महावाक्यार्थस्यांशाः परस्परं स्वरूपेण चाङ्गैः सन्धीयन्त इति सन्धयः ।
— पृ० ५४

६३. समवकारः —

— समवेतैरवकीर्णैश्चार्थैः ...... क्रियते निबध्यते इति समवकारः । — पृ० १२४

६४. समाहितिः —

— सम्यग् आ समन्तात् धानम् स्थापनं समाहितिः । — पृ० ६२

६५. सात्वती —

— सत् सत्त्वं प्रकाशस्तद् यत्रास्ति तत् सत्त्वं मनस्तत्र भवा सात्वती । — पृ० १५६

६६. सात्त्विकः —

— अवहितं मनः सत्त्वं तत् प्रयोजनं हेतुरस्येति सात्त्विकः । — पृ० १९०

APPENDIX-B

GRAMMATICAL REFERENCES IN THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA

१. अभिनवगुप्तस्तु नमनार्थस्यापि नटेर्नाटकशब्दं व्युत्पादयति तत्र तु घटादित्वेन ह्रस्वाभावश्चिन्त्यः । — पृ० २८

२. ख्याताद्यराजस्य चरितं यत्रेत्यन्यपदार्थः । — पृ० २७

३. ... इति स्वयोगव्यवस्थापकत्वेनैवावधार्यते, नान्ययोगव्यवच्छेदेन । — पृ० २९

४. क्रमश्च व्युत्तरं चेति समाहारः । — पृ० ३१

५. तरतमप्रत्ययौ नान्तरीयकतया सविकाशाल्पशब्दं प्रकृतिमाकर्षतः । — पृ० ४१

६. आविमर्शं इति यदा मर्यादायामाङ् तदा मुखप्रतिमुखगर्भान्, यदा पुनरभिविधौ तदा विमर्शमभिव्याप्य विरमति । — पृ० ४४

७. ... प्रकरी । औणादिके इप्रत्यये संज्ञाशब्दत्वेन ङीत्वम् । — पृ० ४६

८. नञोऽल्पार्थत्वात् । — पृ० ७०

९. नाटयति नर्तयति व्युत्पाद्यमनासीत्यचि गौरादेराकृतिगणत्वाच्च ङ्यां नाटी । अल्पत्वात्स्वार्थे कपि नाटिकेत्यपि । — पृ० १११

१०. 'सन्धि-वृत्तयः' इतीतरेतरयोगो द्वन्द्वः । — पृ० ११२

११. भारती वाग्व्यापारविषय एवेत्ययोगव्यवच्छेदः । — पृ० १५३

१२. "आङ् मर्यादायाम्" तेन मुखसन्धिं सम्प्राप्य निवर्तते । "ईषदर्थे वा" तत ईषन्मुखं ...... आरम्भः । — पृ० १५३

१३. ...... संज्ञाशब्दत्वेन बाहुलकात् ङीत्वम् । — पृ० १५६

१४. आरेण प्रतोदकेन तुल्या भटा उद्धताः पुरुषा आरभटास्ते सन्त्यस्यामिति 'ज्योत्स्नादित्वादणि' आरभटी । — पृ० १५८

१५. न बहिःस्था चित्तवृत्तिरिति पृषोदरादित्वादवहित्था । — पृ० १८४

१६. वागनुकार्या प्रयोजनं हेतुरस्येति "प्रयोजनम्" इतिकणि वाचिकः । — पृ० १८८

१७. ...... प्रवेशः प्रयोजनमस्या इतीकणि प्रावेशिकी । — पृ० १९३

१८. ...... निष्क्रमः तत्प्रयोजना अनुबन्धिकप्रवेशकादिस्वपरादिकमनुभवपत्रादौ नैष्क्रामिकी । — पृ० १९४

१९. उद्दिष्टव्यवधानुत्कृष्टेऽर्थे ततः प्रकृष्टार्थे तमप्युत्तमा । — पृ० १९५

२०. ...... आधिक्य-बहुत्वभाविनोस्तरप्तमप्प्रत्यययोरनुकृतिस्तारतमाविति तयोर्भावस्तारतम्यं- ...... । — पृ० १९५

२१. अथेत्याह्निकानन्तर्यार्थः । — पृ० २०५

२२. देवशब्देन सुराः [illegible] गृह्यन्ते । — पृ० २०८

APPENDIX-C

SUBHĀṢITAS IN THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA

१. अकवित्वं परस्तावत् कलङ्कः पाठशालिनाम् ।
अन्यकाव्यैः कवित्वं तु कलङ्कस्यापि चूलिका ॥ — पृ० २४

२. अलङ्कारमृदुः पन्थाः कथादीनां सुसञ्चरः ।
दुःसञ्चरस्तु नाट्यस्य रसकल्लोलसङ्कुलः ॥ — पृ० २३

३. अशक्ये सर्वमुत्सृज्यापगच्छेत् । — पृ० ३६

४ आरङ्कादू भूपतिं यावद् औचितीं न विदन्ति ये ।
स्पृहयन्ति कवित्वाय खेलनं ते सुमेधसाम् ॥ — पृ० २३

५ उन्मिषन्ति च भ्रान्तेरपि शृङ्गारादयः । — पृ० १८९

६. कदाचिन्मांसदृशो वस्तुस्वरूपे भ्राम्यन्ति न पुनर्ज्ञानदृशः । — पृ० १८९

७ कवित्वबन्ध्याः क्लिश्यन्ति सुखाकर्तुं जगन्ति ये ।
नेत्रे निमील्य विद्वांसः तेऽधिरोहन्ति पर्वतम् ॥ — पृ० २४

८. दुःखी हि दुःखितवार्तया सुखमभिमन्यते । — पृ० १५९

९. दृष्टा हि जीवतः पुनरावृत्तिः । — पृ० ३६

१०. न गीत-वाद्य-नृतज्ञाः लोकस्थितिविदो न ये ।
अभिनेतुं च कर्तुं च प्रबन्धांस्ते बहिर्मुखाः ॥ — पृ० २३

११. न हि नवनवार्थव्युत्पत्तशब्दप्रथनमेव काव्यम्, ... किन्तु विचित्ररसपवित्रशब्दार्थनिवेशः । — पृ० १७१

१२. नानार्थशब्दलौल्येन पराञ्चो ये रसामृतात् ।
विद्वांसस्ते कवीन्द्राणाम् अर्हन्ति न पुनः कथाम् ॥ — पृ० २३

१३. नासिकान्ते द्वयं भिन्नं द्वयोर्व्रीडा रसज्ञयोः ।
कुचाभावः कुरङ्गाक्ष्याः काव्याभावो विपश्चितः ॥ — पृ० २४

१४. प्रवृत्तचक्रेणाक्रान्तो राज्ञा बलवताऽबलः ।
सन्धिनोपनमेत् तूर्णं कोषदण्डात्मभूमिभिः ॥ — पृ० ३६

१५. प्राणाः कवित्वं विद्यानां लावण्यमिव योषिताम् ।
त्रैविद्यवेदिनोऽप्यस्मै ततो नित्यं कृतस्पृहाः ॥ — पृ० २३

१६. पानकमाधुर्यमिव च तीक्ष्णस्वादेन दुःखास्वादेन सुतरां सुखानि स्वदन्ते। — पृ० १५९

१७. लब्धपरिपोषो हि रसः ...मालतीमाल्यमिव म्लायति । — पृ० १७५

१८. विघ्नैरपि हन्यमानाश्च महात्मानो विशेषतो यतन्ते । — पृ० ५६

१९. विपाककमनीयमपि सहकारफलं विरसमुद्वेगमावहति । — पृ० १७१

२०. विस्मयन्ते हि शिरश्छेदकारिणाऽपि प्रहारकुशलेन वैरिणा शौण्डीरमानिनः । — पृ० १५९

२१. श्रेयांसि बहुविघ्नानि भवन्ति । — पृ० ५६

२२. श्लेषालङ्कारभाजोऽपि रसा निःस्यन्दकर्कशाः ।
दुर्भगा इव कामिन्यो प्रीणन्ति न मनो गिरः ॥ — पृ० २३

२३. स कविस्तस्य काव्येन मर्त्या अपि सुधान्धसः ।
रसोर्मिघूर्णिता नाट्ये यस्य नृत्यति भारती ॥ — पृ० २३

२४. साक्षाद् दृष्टफलार्थी हि लोकः । — पृ० २७

APPENDIX-D

VIEWS OF THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA ON AUCITYA

The authors of the ND have laid considerable stress on this principle of Aucitya[1].

In the very introductory verses the ND emphatically points out that one who does not have a sense of propriety and still aspires for recognition as a great poet becomes a laughing stock of the learned[2]. Further it praises the goddess of speech because she is the proper deity[3] to be worshipped here. The principle is to be applied everywhere in literature, e.g., devising the plot (selecting the incidents to be staged), delineation of the characters, accomplishment of fruit, depiction of sentiments, states, etc. At every step the propriety has to be maintained. While discussing the flaws of the sentiments the ND points out that all the flaws, in fact, can be included under one single name, viz., Anaucitya. They are separately mentioned so that the different types of Anaucitya may be clearly understood. They are simply the illustrations of Anaucitya. The Sandhyaṅgas also should be used with propriety.

The following are the instances where the ND refers specifically to Aucitya -

१.	तेनोद्धतादीनां यथाचित्यमपरेऽपि धर्मा द्रष्टव्याः ।	— पृ० ३०
२.	कविरपि न स्वेच्छया फलस्योत्कर्षं निबद्धुमर्हति किन्त्वौचित्येन ।	— पृ० ३०
३	यस्य धीरोद्धतादेर्यदेव फलमुचितं तस्यैवोत्कर्षो निबन्धनीयः ।	— पृ० ३०
४.	नीरसानुचितं सूच्यम् ।	— पृ० ३०
५.	तस्य नीरसानुचितस्य सूच्यस्य विपर्ययः सरसमुचितं च प्रयुज्यते ।	— पृ० ३१
६.	एको नायकौचित्येन अन्यतमोऽङ्गी रसो यत्र ।	— पृ० ३२
७.	अयुक्तमनुचितम् ।	— पृ० ३३
८.	अन्यथेति औचित्येनाविरोधेन वा ।	— पृ० ३३
९.	तथाऽत्रापि सर्वमौचित्यानतिक्रमेणायोज्यम् ।	— पृ० १२०
१०.	दोषोऽनौचित्यम् ...... ।	
	सहृदयानां विचिकित्साहेतुः कर्मानौचित्यं तच्चानेकधा ।	— पृ० १७३
११.	अङ्गाभ्यादयश्च दोषाः परमार्थतो नौचित्यान्तःपातिनोऽपि	
	सहृदयानामनौचित्यव्युत्पादनार्थमुदाहरणत्वेनोपात्ताः ।	— पृ० १७५

1. The history of Aucitya has been elaborately and exhaustively treated by Dr. V. Raghavan in his "Some Concepts of Alaṁkāra Śāstra", pp. 194-257.
2. Ā raṅkād bhūpatiṁ yāvad aucitiṁ na vidanti ye;
Spṛhayanti kavitvāya khelanaṁ te sumedhasām. —ND p, 23.
3. Sāmucityeṣṭādhidaivatasya......ND, p. 24.

१२. ...... प्रकर्षवर्णनं च रसानगमनौचित्यं द्रष्टव्यम् । — पृ० १७४
१३ यथायोगमिति रसौचित्यानतिक्रमेण । — पृ० १७७
१४. एषा वियोगिनां ...... औचित्यानतिक्रमेण लिङ्ग्यादयो ... विदूषकाः । — पृ० १९९
१५. यथौचित्यं च नेतॄणां नायिकाः कुलजादयः ।
औचित्यं प्रकृत्यवस्थाचारदेशकालाद्यविरोधः । — पृ० २०७-८

The idea of Aucitya is also echoed in the following sentences :

१. अमीषां च स्वसन्धौ सन्ध्यन्तरे च योग्यतया निबन्धः । — पृ० ११५
२ स्वयं वा यत् कल्प्यते तदपि कर्माद्यानुरूप्येणैवेति । — पृ० २१३
३. ...... गोत्रकर्मणोरानुरूप्येण नाम कल्पनीयम् । — पृ० २१३

According to the authors of the ND this type of propriety or impropriety is known only to a great poet (Prabandhakavi) whose chief aim is to develop Rasa and not to smaller poets indulging themselves in the skilful arrangement of words and meaning only[1].

1. ND, p. 115.

APPENDIX-E

SOME PLAYS REFERRED TO BY THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA

A notable feature of the ND is the ample illustrations and citations quoted from different works. Amongst these we come across many works, some of which seem to have been quoted by the ND for the first time and are no longer extant. It is beyond the scope of this work to treat in detail the various implications of all of this large number of plays quoted by Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra. In fact, it will be a very interesting topic for the students of ancient Indian literature to make further research in the matter which is apt to shed considerable light on some of the pages of history which still remain in the dark.

The total number of works that the authors of the ND quote does not exceed sixty three, out of which eleven are Rāmacandra's own works. About two-third of the total number of plays quoted in the ND are unpublished. Hence it is quite evident how important these references can prove to be.

The ND has quoted one verse from Bhāsa's Svapnavāsavadatta while explaining the Saṁdhyaṅga named Anumāna. The ND reads, "As in the Svapnavāsavadatta written by Bhāsa, Vatsarāja, having observed the stone-slab under the bower of Śephālikā-trees, said, "The flowers are crushed under feet, the stone-slab is warm. Therefore, I truly infer that some body (damsel) who was sitting here has instantly run away having seen me".

We know that Bhāsa who was held even by Kālidāsa in very high esteem,[1] was simply a name as long as 1913. A.D. when thirteen plays of unknown authorship were discovered by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī in Trivandrum and were ascribed to Bhāsa.

The ND here refers to the Svapnavāsavadatta written by Bhāsa. This reference to the name of the author may be significant. It may possibly suggest that there were many plays (at least more than one) bearing the above title and what the ND refers to here is the one written by Bhāsa[2]. It is to be noted here that the verse quoted by the ND is not found in the Svapnavāsavadatta that is edited by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. This would mean that either the present play is not the one which was originally written by Bhāsa but is an abridged stage-version

1. Vide Māl. I, p. 2.
2. Udayana is known to be a very popular prince in ancient literaturo. Even Kalidāsa makes a aeference to his popularity in his Meghadūta.

of the original play by some other poet or that the verse has been left out by the inadvertance of the scribe. The NLR also quotes from the SV, Act I where the stage-manager, having heard the order of driving the persons out of the way, says, "How is this driving off in a penance-grove?" (Having observed) "Low! This is the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa who has girded up his loins to restore the (lost) kingdom to Vatsarāja, being driven out of the way by the men of Padmāvatī."[1] But the actual words of the Sūtradhāra are not found in the SV that is available to us, even though the particular episode is there. Similarly, the BP gives two quotations from the SV, out of which one verse[2] is there in the SV but the words of Udayana, "Come, Vāsavadattā, where are you going?"[3] are not to be found in the present text.

The above instances may go to strengthen the proposition that the present play is a stage-edition of the original SV of Bhāsa.

Another play quoted by the ND and which is generally overlooked by other rhetoricians except Bhoja is the Devīcandragupta of Viśākhadatta, the celebrated author of Mudrārākṣasa. Rāmacandra has quoted this play seven times.

The Devīcandragupta is a play of much historical value. The story deals with the love-affair of Candragupta and Dhruvadevī, the queen of Rāmagupta, the elder brother of Candragupta and the king who for the sake of peace agrees to the humiliating condition of giving away his wife Dhruvadevī to a Śaka king. Candragupta, the younger brother, does not approve of this Sandhi and himself goes to the Śaka king in the disguise of the queen and kills him. Dhruvadevī is naturally attracted towards this brave young prince and the love develops. The legend goes that Candragupta murdered his elder brother, usurped his throne, and married Dhruvadevī.

Dr. V. Raghavan has given a detailed outline of the plot of the play by collecting all the scattered references and quotations available in the works on dramaturgy wherein the ND stands the foremost[4]. About half a dozen of the quotations from the play, that we come across in the ND goes a long way in giving us a fair idea about the nature of the work and sheds a flood of light on some of the very important pages of the ancient Indian history as Candragupta of the play is

1. NLR, p. 51.
2. SD VI, 3; BP, p. 239.
3. BP, p. 239.
4. Vide Dr. Raghavau's article "Devicandragupta". Also his "Social play in Sanskrit".

identified with the highly celebrated king Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty who was known as Vikramāditya, the founder of the Vikrama era[1].

The *Puṣpadūṣitaka* is another important play of Prakaraṇa type quoted by the ND not less than eight times. It is referred to as an example of a Prakaraṇa with the theme of pure domestic love, where the heroine is virtuous and born in a high family[2]. Like the MṚC it is dominated by pathos[3]. Here the fruit depends upon fate as in the MṚC[4]. The citations of the ND which are based mainly upon the Abhi. help considerably in getting some glimpses of the nature of the plot.

Another important Prakaraṇa quoted only once by the ND and which is not so well-known is the *Anaṅgasenāharinandi* of Śuktivāsakumāra whose no other work has come down to us. The story deals with the love-affair between Harinandin, the hero, and Anaṅgasenā, a courtesan. The heroine is Mādhavī. Here the hero although innocent accepts the charge of theft and suffers its consequences in order to save a Brahmin youth[5]. Thus it is a drama of love and sacrifice.

1. Dr. U. P. Shah has also treated the particular legend connected with Candragupta in his article "Vikramādityasaga" where he has interpreted the whole issue in a new light. According to him Rāmagupta himself left the throne and also his wife in favour of Candragupta whom he loved so much and he accepted the life of a hermit.
2. ND, p. 119.
3. ND, p. 120.
4. ND, p. 50.
5. Vide ND, p. 95.

APPENDIX-F

JAINA TRAITS AS FOUND IN THE NĀṬYADARPAṆA

A work on poetics leaves little scope for the author to give expression to his religious convictions. The subject being scientific ought to be treated in an equally scientific and impersonal way and the religious references would naturally be out of place. The authors of the ND seem to have realized this and consequently we do not come across notable references to Jainism. Still however, the authors have full regard for and deep knowledge of Jainism which at places is, consciously or unconsciously, revealed.

At the very commencement of the work we find the authors paying glorious tribute to the speech of the Jinas (Jainī vāk) which is the bestower of all the fourfold objects of human existence, viz., Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. This speech is looked upon to have permeated the entire universe in twelve forms. In the commentary that follows we find a clear exposition of the view that the speech of the Jinas is the prime source from which the later literature evolved[1]. Moreover, they compare the twelve forms of Rūpakas with the twelve Aṅga-texts which are the principal texts of the Jaina canon totally consisting of 45 texts. The whole of the discussion points to their knowledge of the canon. Here even though the authors give an alternative explanation of the verse which is interpreted in a non-religious way, it is not far to see that the authors apparently mean the earlier i. e. religious interpretation and the alternative one merely reveals their pedantry and command over language.

In the discussion of Prarocanā which is one of the nineteen Aṅgas of the Pūrvaraṅga the authors point out that other Aṅgas of Pūrvaraṅga are rejected because their order is useless and their fruit which is considered to be the propitiation of different gods is merely cheating the faithful and innocent votaries[2]. Even while discussing the Nāndī they assert that other limbs of Pūrvaraṅga are futile[3]. This peculiar attitude of non-belief in the worship of gods and godesses is a special characteristic of the Jainas. The Jainas whose religion is based mainly on normal principles like non-violence, truth etc. often ridicule the Brahmanical rites and rituals as ordained in the sacred books like the

1. Jinopadiṣṭaṁ hyarthaṁ ṛṣayo grathnanti – ND, p. 24.
2. ND, p. 155.
3. Vide ND, p 193.

Vedas[1]. They look upon the Hindus as heretics[2]. So the above lines reflect clearly the religious propensity of our authors.

But barring the above exceptions we hardly find any Jaina trait in the work. The authors of the ND draw illustrations from the Brahmanical works[3]. Rāmacandra has written a number of plays based on the story of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata and the heroes of the Brahmanical legends like Hariścandra, Nala, Bhīma, which points out that, though himself a Jaina, he was not fanatic but tolerant towards other sects.

1. Cf. Uttarādhyanasūtra XIV, 12.
2. Cf. Sirisirivālakahā, verses 60, 77.
3. In fact, Jainas have made full use of the literature that was available to them. They adopted the popular stories of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa to explain their own principles by conveniently modifying them to suit their religion and by that mode they tried to popularize their own religion.

APPENDIX-G

NĀṬYADARPAṆA : SOME TEXTUAL EMENDATIONS

It has been a general experience of the oriental scholars working in the field that the texts of the manuscripts of a number of Sanskrit works are highly corrupt. Scribes are quite often careless and create problems on account of their want of accuracy, But the problem becomes worse confounded especially when sufficient number of manuscripts of a work are not available or when one manuscript is a verbatim copy of another. In such cases a comparative study of other works on the same subject renders valuable assistance in emending the text at several places.

It has been pointed out earlier in ch. 7 of the present work that the text of the Abhinavabhāratī which also is corrupt at a number of places can be corrected wich the help of the ND as the latter has considerably borrowed from it. What is true of the Abhi. and others is applicable to the ND also.

The text of the ND is also corrupt at several places. It may, therefore, be corrected having taken into consideration earlier works on dramaturgy from which it has possibly borrowed. An attempt is made here to suggest a few emendations in the text especially on the basis of a comparative study with earlier sources.[1]

1. While enumerating the Sandhyantaras the ND reads as follows :—

साहसं च भयं चैव ह्री(भी)र्माया क्रोध एव च ।
ओजः संवरणं भ्रान्तिः तथा हेत्ववधारणम् ॥ —etc.

— ND, p. 116, line 7

Here 'ह्री' is obviously incorrect. It is corrected by replacing it with भी. But this does not seem to be justified as भी is a synonym of भय which immediately precedes it. It should, therefore, be corrected on the basis of the NS from which the authors have probably borrowed it. The NS reads here ह्री (shame or bashfulness) in stead of भी which is more plausible. It may also be धी (intellect) if we take into consideration the text of the NLR wherein the word 'धी' occurs in its stead. (Vide NLR, pp. 39, 41).[2]

---

1. It is commendable that the second edition of the ND published in 1959 has effected the textual corrections at a number of places. Here are mentioned only such cases which still deserve consideration.

2 Ācārya Viśveśvara follows the latter one. (Hindi Nāṭyadarpaṇa, p. [illegible]).

2. ND, p. 89, lines 12-3

......परस्परवधनप्रवृत्तयोर्यस्य युद्धादिकाधिक्येन यत्कर्मेतरव्याप्तिसम्बाद्धं समर्थं तत्कर्म... ।
may be corrected as परस्पर ... यत्कर्मेतरप्रसिसम्बाद्धं...... ।
Also cf. Abhi. III, p. 51.

3. ND, p. 117, line 6

Verse no. 67 'c' कल्पेन फल-वस्तूनाम् should be corrected as कल्पेन-फल-वस्तूनाम् The word कल्पेन as an independant Pada is rather confusing. The editor suggests an emendation as कल्पेत but this is not quite justified and hence it is dropped in the second edn. But there also the mistake remains. In fact कल्पेन is not a separate word but a part of a long compound, viz., कल्पेन-फल-वस्तूनाम्. इन here means the 'hero' as pointed out by the authors themselves in the commentary.

4. ND, p. 162, lines 23-4

आभिमुख्यं च पोषकत्वं च यद्वा व्यभिचरन्ति ... etc. should be emended as आभिमुख्यं च पोषकत्वम् । यद्वा ... as is done in the 'Hindi Nāṭyadarpaṇa' by Ācarya Viśveśvara.

5. ND, p. 162, lines 25-6

स्वविभावव्यभिचारिणः भावे भावात् अभावेऽभावाच्च ।
should be corrected as स्वविभावव्यभिचारिणः भावेऽभावात्, अभावे भावाच्च । in view of the context. The authors want to point out that Vyabhicāribhāvas do not invariably accompany their Vibhāvas just as a person who makes use of an elixir of life does not experience dejection, slothfulness, fatigue etc.[1]

6. ND, p. 177, line 4

दयोपेक्षारति should be written as दयोपेक्षाऽरति. 'ऽ' is necessary as it is *Arati* and not *Rati* as Ācārya Viśveśvara as understood. Rati has already been accepted as the Sthāyibhāva of Śṛṅgāra by the ND also in keeping with Bharata.

7. ND, p. 171, line 13

स णाज्ञानक्रियादयो विशिष्टधर्माः ।

does not make much sense in the particular context and so must be amended as सद्गुणा ज्ञानक्रियादयो विशिष्टधर्माः । The line thus explains the word Sadguṇa in the Kārika, which exactly is what the authors propose to do.

---

1. रसायनमुपयुक्तवतो हि ग्लान्यालस्यश्रमप्रभृतयो न भवन्ति । — ND, p. 162.

8. ND, p. 178, line 22

नाथे च रजनानिमित्तमापानमपि क्वचिदभिनीयते ।

Here the word *Nāthe* does not make any sense and therefore may be corrected as *Nāṭye* in view of the NS VII, 44 which runs as–

रङ्गे पिबतः कार्या मदवृद्धिर्नाट्ययोगमासाद्य ।

9. ND, p. 183, lines 245

निर्माल्यक्षीरघटवक्त्रशरावाभरणोपभोगादि ...[1] ।

Here the word *Vīraghaṭa* is perplexing and appears to be incorrect. The line may therefore be emended as

निर्माल्यक्षीरघटवक्त्रशराव ... etc. The line bears verbal similarity with the NS VI, p. 372 and the KS, p. 137, where the correct reading is there and which reads as निर्माल्यक्षीरघटवक्त्रशरावाभरणादिभिर्वर्णयेत् ।

(KS, p. 137)

10. ND, p. 189, line 25

उद्घटितसमादयः षट् may preferably be emended as उद्घट्टितसमादयः षट् in view of the NS (GOS) IX, 265 and the Abhi. on the same.

11. ND, p. 190 line 11

प्रतरणे जठर–शय–काया–बाहुभ्यां जलविपाटनवती च ।

is understood by Acārya Viśveśvara as a Dvandva compound but does not seem to be justified as dual case-ending in the case of a Dvandva compound consisting of four members is gramatically incorrect. Moreover ' शय ' if taken as a hand will be redundant on account of the mention of the word ' बाहु ' along with it. Similarly conjunction च also becomes insignificant in that case.

The line therefore needs to be corrected as—

प्रतरणे जठरशयकाया बाहुभ्यां जलविपाटनवती च ।

Here जठरशयकाया should be translated as 'with the body resting or lying on the belly,' which seems to convey the same idea which the NS wants to convey by किञ्चिन्नताग्रकाया (G.O.S) XII, 100.

12. ND, p. 110, line 22

आलम्बाय न एष वेत्ति ... appears to be defective from the point of view of syntax. Also if न is separate it should be joined with एषः as नैषः according to the rules of Sandhi. The line, therefore, should be corrected as —

आलम्बायन एष वेत्ति (This Ālambayana knows ......) as suggested by Dr. V. Raghavan.[2]

---

1. Acārya Viśveśvara translates the word Viraghata as earthen pots hung on the the trees like Pippala etc.
2. Vide The Social Play in Sanskrit, p. 21.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL LITERATURE IN SANSKRIT ON THE SCIENCE OF DRAMA AND POETRY

Amṛtānandayogin : Alaṁkārasaṁgraha (ed. V. Krishnamacharya & K. R. Sarma. Adyar Library, Madras, 1949).

Ānandavardhana : Dhvanyāloka (ed. Dr. Nagendra, Delhi, 1952).

Bhāmaha : Kāvyālaṁkāra (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1938).

Bhānudatta : Rasamañjarī (Vidyāvilāsa Press, Benares, First edition).

Bhānudatta : Rasataraṅginī (Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay, 1958).

Bharata : Nāṭyaśāstra (Kāvyamālā Series, Bombay, 1943).

Bharata : Nāṭyaśāstra (with Abhinava's commentary) Vol. I (G. O. S., Baroda, 1954).

Bharata : Nāṭyaśāstra Vol. II (G.O.S., Baroda, 1934).

Bharata : Nāṭyaśāstra Vol. III (G.O.S., Baroda, 1955).

Bhoja : Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, Chapters 1 to 8 (ed. G. R. Josyer, Mysore, 1955).

Bhoja : Śṛṅgāraprakāśa (MS) (Oriental Institute Library, Baroda).

Daṇḍin : Kāvyādarśa (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1958).

Dhanañjaya : Daśarūpaka (with Avaloka) (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1941).

Hemacandra : Kāvyānuśāsana Vol. I & II (ed. Rasiklal Parikh, Bombay, 1958).

Jagannātha : Rasagaṅgādhara (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1947).

Jayadeva : Chandrāloka (Chowkhamba Sanskrit series, Varanasi, 1960).

Mammaṭa : Kāvyaprakāśa (ed. R. D. Karmarkar, Poona, 1933).

Nandikeśvara : Abhinayadarpaṇa (ed. M. Ghosh, Calcutta, 1934).

Niḥśaṅkaśārṅgadeva : Saṅgītaratnākara (ed. Harinarayana Apte, Poona, 1896).

Pāṇḍeya Viśveśvara : Rasacandrikā (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1926).

Rājaśekhara : Kāvyamīmāṁsā (ed. C. D. Dalal nnd R. A. Sastri, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1934).

Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra : Nāṭyadarpaṇa (G.O.S., Baroda, First Edition, 1929).

Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra : Hindi Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ed. Ācārya Viśveśvara, Delhi, 1961).

Rudraṭa : Kāvyālaṁkāra (with the commentary of Nemisādhu) (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1928).

Rūpagosvāmin : Ujjvalanīlamaṇi (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1932).

Sāgaranandin : Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa (ed. M. Dillan, London, 1937).

Śāradātanaya : Bhāvaprakāśana (G.O.S., Baroda, 1930).
Siddhicandrasūri : Kāvyaprakāśakhaṇḍana (ed. R. C. Parikh, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1953).
Śiṅgabhūpāla : Rasārṇavasudhākara (T. Ganapati Sastri, Trivandrum 1916).
Vāmana : Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1889).
Vidyānātha : Pratāparudrīya (ed. C. Sankararama Sastri, Madras, 1950).
Viśvanātha : Sāhityadarpaṇa (ed. Motilal Banarasidas, Benares, 1956).
Vyāsa Dvaipāyana : Agnipurāṇa (ed. H. N. Apte, Anandasrama, Poona, 1900).

OTHER SANSKRIT WORKS

Amara : Amarakośa (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1934).
Bāṇa : Kādambarī (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1948).
Bhāsa : Bhāsanāṭakacakram (ed. C. V. Devadhar, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, 1951).
Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa : Veṇīsaṁhāra (ed. A. B. Gajendragadkar, Bombay, 1941, Third edition).
Bhavabhūti : Mahāvīracarita (ed. T. R. R. Aiyar, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1936).
Bhavabhūti : Mālatīmādhava (ed. M. P. Tailor, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1926).
Bhavabhūti : Uttararāmacarita (ed. R. D. Karmarkar, Āryabhūṣaṇa Press, Poona, 1954).
Bodhāyana : Bhagavadajjukīyam (ed. P. A. Achan, Maṅgalodayam Press, Trichur, 1925).
Candraprabhasūri : Prabhāvakacarita (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1909).
Dixita Bhaṭṭoji : Vaiyākaraṇa Siddhāntakaumudī (ed. W. L. Sastri Paṇaśīkara, 11th edition, Nirnaya Sugar Press, Bombay, 1938).
Harṣa : Nāgānanda (P. V. Ramanujasvami, Madras, 1950).
Harṣa : Priyadarśikā (M. R. Kale, Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay, 1928).
Harṣa : Ratnāvalī (M. R. Kale, Bombay, 1921).
Hemacandra : Pramāṇamīmāṁsā (ed. Pandit Sukhalalaji, Singhi Jaina Grantha Mala, 1939).
Hemacandra : Śrīhemacandra-śabdānuśāsanarahasyavṛtti (ed. P. B. Parekh, Mehsana, 1951).
Jainastotrasandoha : (ed. Muni Caturavijaya, Ahmedabad, 1932).
Jayadeva : Prasannarāghava (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1922).
Jayasiṁhasūri : Kumārapālacaritra (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1926).
Jinamaṇḍana gaṇi : Kumārapālaprabandha (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1915).

Jinavijaya muni : Purātanaprabandhasaṁgraha (Singhi Jaina Grantha Mala, Calcutta, 1936).
Kālidāsa : Abhijñānaśākuntala (ed. A. B. Gajendragadkar, (Popular Book Stores, Surat, 1950).
Kālidāsa : Kumārasambhava (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1916).
Kālidāsa : Mālavikāgnimitra (ed. R. D. Karmarkar, 4th edition, Poona, 1950).
Kālidāsa : Meghadūta (ed. S. K. De, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1957).
Kālidāsa : Raghuvaṁśa (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1920).
Kālidāsa : Vikramorvaśīya (ed. R. N. Gaidhani, Royal Book Stall, Poona, 1st edition).
Merutuṅgasūri : Prabandhacintāmaṇi (Singhi Jaina Grantha Mala, Ahmedabad, 1933).
Murāri : Anargharāghava (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1929).
Rājaśekhara : Karpūramañjarī (Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan, Banaras, 1955).
Rājaśekhara : Prabandhakośa (Singhi Jaina Grantha Mala, Ahmedabad, 1935).
Rāmacandra : Mallikāmakaranda (MS) (from Puṇyavijayaji,Ahmedabad).
Rāmacandra : Nalavilāsa (G. O. S., Baroda, 1926).
Rāmacandra : Nirbhayabhīmavyāyoga (ed. Hargovindadas and Bechardas, Benares, 1910).
Rāmacandra : Kaumudīmitrāṇanda (Jaina Ātmānanda Sabhā, Bhavnagar).
Rāmacandra : Kumāravihāraśataka (Jaina Ātmānanda Sabhā, Bhavnagar, 1909).
Rāmacandra : Raghuvilāsa (MS) (from Puṇyavijayaji, Ahmedabad).
Rāmacandra : Satyahariścandra (ed. B R. Arte and S. V. Puranik).
Ratnamandiragaṇi : Upadeśataraṅgiṇī (ed. H. B. Shah, Benares, Vira Samvat 2437 i. e. 1910).
Ratnaśekharasūri : Sirisirivālakahā (Prakrit) (Part-1) (R. R. Kothari & Co., Ahmedabad).
Rudradāsa : Candralekhā (ed. D. N. Upadhye, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavana, Bombay, 1945).
Śārṅgadhara : Śārṅgadharapaddhati (ed. Peterson, Bombay, 1888).
Somaprabhasūri : Kumārapālapratibodha (ed. M. J. Gandhi, Ahmedabad, 1940).
Śūdraka : Mṛcchakaṭika (ed. V. G. Paranjape, Poona, 1937).
Taittirīyopaniṣad (ed. Swami Shivānandas, Madras, 1949).
Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (ed. J. G. Joshi, Ahmedabad, 1925).
Vākpati : Gauḍavaho (ed. S. P. Pandit, B.O.R.I., Poona, 1927).

Viśākhadatta : Mudrārākṣasa (ed. Deshpande, Popular Book Store, Surat, 1947).

Yāska : Nirukta (ed. M. Bakshi, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1930).

CRITICAL LITERATURE IN ENGLISH.

Apte V. S. : Practical Sanskrit English Dictionary (ed. P. K. Gode & Co. Karve, Poona, 1957–58).

Bhat G. K. : Preface to Mṛcchakaṭika (The New Order Book Co., Ahmedabad, 1953).

Bhat G. K. : Vidūṣaka (The New Order Book Co., Ahmedabad, 1959).

Buhler : Life of Hemacandrācārya (Singhi Jain Granthmala).

Bywater Ingram : Aristotle on the art of poetry (Oxford, 1954).

Dasgupta and De : A history of Sanskrit literature (Classical Period, (Vol. I) University of Calcutta, 1947).

De. S. K. : Aspects of Sanskrit Literature (Firma K. L. Mukhapadhyaya, Calcutta, 1959).

De. S. K. : Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I (London, 1923).

De. S. K. : Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics (Calcutta, 1959).

Encyclopaedia Britanica : 14th edition, 1329.

Ghosh Manamohan · Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata (Asiatic Society of Bangal, Calcutta, 1951).

Gupta C. B. : The Indian Theatre (Motilal Banarasidas, Banaras, 1954).

Gupta Rakesh : Psychological studies in Rasa (Banaras, 1950).

Haas George C. O. : Daśarūpa, a treatise on Hindoo Dramaturgy (New York, 1912).

Hall Fittzedward : The Daśarūpaka or Hindu Canons of Dramaturgy (Calcutta, 1865).

Hazra R. C. : Studies in the Upapurāṇas (Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 1958).

Jagirdar R. V. : Drama in Sanskrit Literature (Popular Book Depot, Bombay, 1947).

Kane P. V. : History of Sanskrit Poetics (Bombay, 1951).

Kulkarni K. P. : Drama and Dramatist (Satara city, 1927).

Hiriyanna M. : Sanskrit Studies (Kāvyālaya Publishers, Mysore, 1954).

Keith A. B. : Sanskrit Drama (Oxford University Press, London, 1954).

Krishnamacariar : History of Classical Sanskrit Literature (Madras, 1937).

Macdonell A. A. : A History of Sanskrit Literature (New Delhi, Fifth Edition).

Majumdar R. C. and Pusalker A. D. : The Struggle for Empire (Bhāratīya Vidyābhavan's History and Culture of Indian People Vol. 5, 1951).

Mankad D. R. : The Types of Sanskrit Drama (Urmiprakāśanamandir, Karachi, 1936).

Mookerjee and Jatia : A Critique of Organ of Knowledge (Calcutta, 1946).
Nariman, Jackson and Ogden : Priyadarśikā (Columbia University Press, New York, 1923).
Pandey K. C. : Comparative Aesthetics (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Banaras, 1950).
Raghavan V. : Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa of Sāgaranandin (Intro. and notes) (American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1960).
Raghavan V. : Number of Rasas (Adyar Library, Adyar, 1940).
Raghavan V. : Some concepts of Alaṁkāraśāstra (Adyar Library, Adyar, 1942).
Raghavan V. : Śṛṅgāramañjarī of Saint Akbar Shah (Hydrabad Archoelogical Department Publication, 1951).
Raghavan V. : Śṛṅgāraprakāśa Vol. I, Part I & II. (Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay, 1940).
Raghavan V. : The Social play in Sanskrit (Indian Institute of culture, Bangalore, 1952).
Sandesara B. J. : Literary circle of Mahāmātya Vistupāla and its contribution to Sanskrit Literature (Singhi Jain Series, Bombay, 1953).
Shastri A. C. : Studies in Sanskrit Aesthetics (Calcutta, 1952, First edition).
Upadhye U. N. : Rudradāsa's Candralekhā (Bhāratīya Vidyābhavan, Bombay, 1945).
Wilson H. H. : Dramas (Second edition, Calcutta, 1900).
Wilson H. H. : Select specimens of the theatre of the Hindus Vol. I (London, 1835).
Winternitz M. : A history of Indian Literature Vol. 2 (University of Calcutta, 1933).

ARTICLES IN ENGLISH

Athavale R. B. : The Problem of Nāndī and Pūrvaraṅga (Oriental Thought).
Balbir G. K. : The conception of Convention of speech in Sanskrit dramaturgists (Proceeding and transaction of A. I. O. C., Nagpur, 1946).
Karmarkar R. D. : The dramatic terms (Annals of B.O.R.I., 1954).
Krishnamoorthy K. : Bharata's theory of Rasa (Poona orientalist Vol. XII June-Oct. 1947).
Kulkarni V. M. : Concept of Saṁdhis in the Sanskrit Drama (Journal of Oriental Research, Baroda, Vol. 5 No. 4, June, 1956).
Kulkarni V. M. : Problem of Patākāsthānaka (Bombay University Journal, Vol. XXIV, Pt. 2, Sept. 1955).
Purohit N. B. : The Apavārita speech in the Sanskrit drama (A.I.O.C., Travankore, 1937).

Raghavan V. : Devīcandragupta (Journal of Benares Hindu University, Vol. 2, 1937-38).

Raghavan V. : Music in ancient Indian Drama (The Journal of the Madras Music Academy, Vol. XXV, 1954).

Raghavan V. : The Vṛttis (Journal of Oriental Research Institute Oct.-Dec. 1932, Jan-March 1933, April-June, 1933).

Shah U. P. : Vikramāditya-saga-II (Journal of Oriental Institute, Baroda, Vol. IV No. 2-3, Dec. 1954 March 1955).

Trivedi K. H. : Abhinavagupta's division of Arthaprahṛtis : an interpretation (Annals of B. O. R. I., Vol. XLV).

Trivedi K. H. : The Problem of Aṅkāsya and Aṅkāvatāra in Sanskrit dramaturgy (J. O. I., Baroda, June 1963).

Vatve K. N. : The problem of Karuṇa rasa and its solution (P. K. Gode Commemoration Volume).

WORKS IN GUJARĀTI

Bakṣi Rāmaprasāda : Nāṭyarasa (Cetana Prakāṣanagṛha, Baroda, 1959).

Bhaṭṭācārya V. : Sāhitya-mīmāṁsā (Translated by S. Joshi, Baroda, 1957).

Dhruva K. M. : Sāhitya ane vivecana Part I (Gujarat Vernacular Society, Ahmedabad, 1939).

Dosi Becaradāsa : Hemacandrācārya (Ahmedabad, 1936).

Kāpadiā H. R. : Jaina Saṁskṛta Sāhityano Itihāsa (Part I) (Baroda, 1956).

Mankad D. R. : Saṁskṛta Nāṭyaśāstra nā Vikāsa ni Rūparekhā (Gujarāt Vernācular Society, Ahmedabad, 1943 (.

Modi M. C. : Hemasamīkṣā (Ahmedabad, 1942).

Pāṭhaka R. V. : Nalavilāsa nāṭaka (Jaina Sāhitya Saṁśodhaka, Khaṇḍa 3, Aṅka 2.).

Śandesarā B. J. : Itihāsanī kedie. (Padmajā Prakāśana, Baroda, 1945).

WORKS IN MARATHI

Desapande : Bhāratīya Sāhityaśāstra (Popular Book Depo, Bombay 1958).

Watve K. N. : Rasavimarśa (Navinakitabakhana, Poona, 1942).

WORKS IN HINDI

Caturvedi Sitarama Śarma : Abhinava Nāṭyaśāstra, (Banaras, 1952).

Sahal Kanhaiyalal : Ālocanāke pathapara (Jayapur, 1948).

Varma Ramalal : Agnipurāṇakā Kāvyaśāstrīya Bhāga (National Publishing House, Delhi, 1959).

INDEX

(A) Subject Index

(B) Works and Authors

ERRATA

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
5	14	Sāttvatī	Sātvatī
24	38	ND. p. 281	ND, p. 31
67	26	NIR	NLR
71	38	DRI	DR
101	last	(1-2)	(Śāk. I,2)
116	10	exemple	example
142	8	commedies	comedies
142	35	the	delit
193	14	I alita	Lalita
193	20	faigned	feigned
193	21	cathes	catches
195	33	Piśaca	such as Piśāca
274	31-2	Pandits	Pundits
278	19	pespicuity	perspicuity
293	34	restricton	restriction
315	last but one	literaturo	literature
315	last	aeference	reference
320	13	wich	with
321	31	स णा ...	सद्गुणा ...